Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-202
Friday
18 October 1991

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-202 *18 October 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ALBANIA

President Alia Leaves for Visit to Turkey *[ATA]* 1
Ozal Welcomes Alia *[ATA]* 1
Turkish Reportage *[cross-reference]* 1
Italian Deputy Minister Inspects Aid Distribution *[ATA]* 1
Vitalone Sees Calm at Durres *[Rome ANSA]* 2
Islamic Conference Delegation Arrives on Visit *[ATA]* 3
Pepa Receives Delegation *[ATA]* 3
Prespa Macedonian Association Holds Conference *[ATA]* 4
Investigations of Former Leaders Debated *[ATA]* 4
Problems of Army Conditions Examined *[BASHKIMI 11 Oct]* 4

BULGARIA

Central Electoral Commission on Latest Results *[Sofia Radio]* 7
Results of Election Analyzed in Detail *[BTA]* 7
Bokov Comments on Zhelev's Support for BSP *[DUMA 12 Oct]* 8
President Zhelev Denies Being Socialist *[TRUD 14 Oct]* 8
SDS Legislative Group News Conference Reported *[Sofia Radio]* 9
Postelectoral Declaration of BSP Presidium *[DUMA 15 Oct]* 9
BSP Claims 55 Percent in Local Elections *[Sofia Radio]* 10
Postelection Coalition Scenarios, DPS Role *[DUMA 15 Oct]* 10
DPS Favors Legislative Coalition With SDS *[BTA]* 11
Agrarians Protest Lateness of Election Results *[ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME 14 Oct]* 11
BZNS-United To Consider 'Disastrous Performance' *[BTA]* 11
Commentary on National Assembly Seat Distribution *[BTA]* 12
Parties Give Briefings on New Legislature *[BTA]* 13
Defense Minister Views Army's Role in Elections *[BULGARSKA ARMIYA 11 Oct]* 13
Ludzhev Interviewed on Turkish Minority *[Istanbul CUMHURIYET 11 Oct]* 14
Purchase of Monitoring Systems for Kozloduy Queried *[OTECHESTVEN VESTNIK 11 Oct]* 15

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Havel Reports on Progress of Constitution Talks *[Prague TV]* 16
Slovak Hungarian Leaders View Minorities Issues *[RESPEKT 14-20 Oct]* 18

HUNGARY

Defense Secretary Views Army's Capabilities *[MAGYARORSZAG 9 Oct]* 21
Interior Ministry on Border Traffic Restrictions *[MTI]* 21
Yugoslav Defectors Interviewed on Army Practices *[168 ORA 8 Oct]* 21
Financier Analyzes State Finance Reform *[NEPSZAVA 14 Oct]* 23

POLAND

Walesa Interviewed on National Issues *[Warsaw Radio]* 24
Prime Minister Bielecki Discusses Election Issues *[GAZETA KRAKOWSKA 8 Oct]* 33
KLD Leader Discusses Possible Political Allies *[GAZETA WYBORCZA 7 Oct]* 37
Walesa Views Current Problems in Europe *[RESPEKT 7-13 Oct]* 38

ROMANIA

Stolojan Introduces New Government to Iliescu *[ROMPRES]* 41
Stolojan Speech Reported *[Bucharest Radio]* 41
Holds News Conference *[ROMPRES]* 42
Campeanu Defends PNL Decision To Join Cabinet *[ROMPRES]* 42
Press Comments on Stolojan's New Cabinet *[ROMPRES]* 42
Poll Indicates Majority Favors Faster Reform *[ROMPRES]* 43
UDMR Council 'Renounces' Planned Rally *[ROMPRES]* 43
Social Democratic Leader on Party Goals *[LIBERTATEA 8-9 Oct]* 44
SRI Director's News Conference 'Unsatisfactory' *[TINERETUL LIBER 9 Oct]* 44
Stanculescu Comments on Serious Energy Situation *[ROMPRES]* 45

YUGOSLAVIA

International

Croatia, Serbia Sign Memorandum on Moscow Talks 46
Croatia 'Satisfied' With Accord *[TANJUG]* 46
Bilateral Talks Agreed Upon *[TANJUG]* 46
Tudjman Briefs Vance on Talks *[TANJUG]* 46
EC Holds Conference on Yugoslavia in The Hague 46
Presidency Members to Take Part *[TANJUG]* 46
Markovic To Attend *[TANJUG]* 47
Tudjman To Attend *[Zagreb Radio]* 47
EC Links Recognition, Army Pullout *[TANJUG]* 47
Unconditional Cease-Fire Accepted *[TANJUG]* 47
Serbia Autonomous Region Leaders Hold Hague Talks *[TANJUG]* 47
Markovic Calls For EC 'Package' Support *[TANJUG]* 48
Croatia, Slovenia To Attend NATO Assembly *[TANJUG]* 48
Kadijevic Letter to UN Envoy on Vukovar Convoy *[TANJUG]* 48

Federal

Prosecutor To Institute Criminal Secession Charges *[TANJUG]* 49
Naval District Agrees To Withdrawal From Pula *[Zagreb Radio]* 50
Air Force 'Forced To Step Up' Attacks 17 Oct *[TANJUG]* 50
Dinar Devaluation Reportedly Planned Soon *[Skopje Radio]* 50
Foreign Ministry: All Slovenian Ambassadors Resign *[TANJUG]* 50
Sprikovski Named New Defense Under Secretary *[TANJUG]* 51

Bosnia-Hercegovina

Izetbegovic Still Hopes for Loose Federation *[Sarajevo Radio]* 51
Interior Minister on 'Deteriorated' Security *[Sarajevo Radio]* 51
Reaction to Bosnian Assembly Sovereignty Decision 51
Official Confirms Validity *[Sarajevo Radio]* 51
Attempt 'To Cheat' Serbs *[TANJUG]* 52
Bosnian Serbs Denounce Act *[Belgrade Radio]* 52
Muslim-Serb Party Criticizes Move *[Belgrade Radio]* 52
Hercegovina Serbs Against Izetbegovic as Hague Envoy *[TANJUG]* 53
Sandzak Muslims Plan 25-27 Oct Referendum *[Sarajevo Radio]* 53

Croatia

Agreement Reached on Vukovar Convoy's Transit *[Zagreb Radio]* 53
Croatian Forces Begin Weapons Surrender in Ilok *[TANJUG]* 53
Air Defense Downs Four Enemy Planes Over Osijek *[Zagreb Radio]* 54
Social Liberal Party Rejects Cease-Fire Acceptance *[TANJUG]* 54

Macedonia

Prime Minister Notes Measures To Protect Economy *[Sarajevo Radio]* 54

Montenegro

Assembly Considers Hague Representation, Stance 55
Bulatovic on EC Document, Sanctions *[TANJUG]* 55
Delegation Empowered To Attend *[TANJUG]* 55
EC Document Stance Adopted *[Belgrade Radio]* 55

Serbia

Assembly Discusses Postponing Elections, Kosovo *[Belgrade Radio]* 55
Tanks Conduct Maneuvers in Pristina Streets *[Zagreb Radio]* 56

Slovenia

Presidency Agrees To Sign Army Withdrawal Accord *[Ljubljana Radio]* 56
SFRY National Bank Blockade Threat 'Not That Easy' *[Ljubljana Radio]* 56

President Alia Leaves for Visit to Turkey

AU1710112091 Tirana ATA in English 1107 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Tirana, October 17 (ATA)—On October 17, Ramiz Alia, president of the republic, left on a friendly visit to Turkey at the invitation of the president of the Republic of Turkey, Turgut Ozal.

Present to see President Ramiz Alia off at Rinas Airport were the chairman of the Presidency of the People's Assembly, Kastriot Islami, the deputy chairmen of this presidency, Lush Perpali, and Aleksander Meksi, the chairman of the Council of Ministers, Ylli Bufi, deputies, government members, representatives of ministries, political institutions and others.

The ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Republic of Turkey to the Republic of Albania, Teoman Surenkok, was also present.

Prior to his departure for Turkey, President Ramiz Alia stated to the reporters: "First of all I want to stress that this friendly visit I will pay to Turkey is a reflection of the close, fraternal relations existing between our two countries. There is no doubt that, in my talks there with my friend, President Ozal, this friendship will assume further developments, which I am convinced that, when President Ozal makes his own visit to Albania, it will assume new impulses in all the fields. On the other hand I will take advantage of the moment and will discuss with President Ozal about the political situation in general and the situation created in the Balkans in particular. I refer here in particular to the events in Yugoslavia, which have constituted a great worry for the Balkans and Europe.

In this context, in our talks I will certainly raise the question of the Albanians in Yugoslavia, of Kosovo, the decision they took with the referendum, proclaiming Kosovo a sovereign, independent state, republic. I believe that this visit to Turkey will naturally carry ahead our relations also in the economic field, in the political, cultural fields.

Ozal Welcomes Alia

AU1710204891 Tirana ATA in English 1901 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Tirana, October 17 (ATA)—The president of the Republic of Albania, Ramiz Alia, arrived to Turkey on October 17.

At the "Mustafa Kemal Ataturk" Airport of Istanbul, the Albanian president, accompanied by Minister of Foreign Affairs Muhamet Kapllani and functionaries of the President's Cabinet, were received by the president of the Turkish Republic, Turgut Ozal; the minister of foreign affairs, Safa Giray; the vali of Istanbul, Hayri Kozakcioglu; the commander of the Military Zone, General Karadayi; the secretary general of the Belediye, Alev Coskun; ambassador at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey, Metin Karaca; the spokesman of the president, Kaya Toper, and other senior personalities.

Present were also the ambassador of Turkey to Tirana, Teoman Surenkok and the general consul of the Republic of Albania to Istanbul, Enver Zeneli.

At the presence of many Turkish journalists both presidents greeted. [sentence as received]

This visit—President Ozal said among others—constitutes a good opportunity to further strengthen friendship between our two peoples and countries and raise to a higher level the cooperation between Albania and Turkey. He assessed and supported the democratic developments in Albania and wished the Albanian fraternal people successes on the road they have embarked.

This visit—President Ramiz Alia pointed out on his part—is an expression of the traditional friendship between the Albanian people and the Turkish one, of the very good relations between our two countries, which gained a new impulse after our meeting in New York last year. President Ramiz Alia assessed the contribution and aids of the European Community for Albania and that of Turkey particularly.

In the afternoon, negotiations were conducted in "Sale" Palace between the presidents Ramiz Alia and Turgut Ozal and the members of the two delegations.

Turkish Reportage

WA1810122091

For Turkish reportage on the visit by President Ramiz Alia to Turkey, including reports on his talks with Turkish President Ozal and remarks of both presidents at a 17 October state dinner, please see the Turkey section of the 18 October West Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Italian Deputy Minister Inspects Aid Distribution

AU1710145091 Tirana ATA in English 0906 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Tirana, October 17 (ATA)—The deputy minister of foreign affairs of the Italian Republic, Senator Claudio Vitalone, arrived on an official and friendly visit to our country on October 16.

The Italian foreign deputy minister, Claudio Vitalone, went to the city of Durres, where he paid a visit to the sea port. He got acquainted with the work carried out here for the unloading and distribution of the aids Italy has accorded Albania and attended the unloading of 7,200 tons of wheat that arrived today from Italy with the ship "Cary".

The commander of the "Italford Pelican" operation, General Antonio Quintano, spoke of the hitherto situation of this operation.

Senator Claudio Vitalone went to the place where the Italian military are stationed in the beach, where he took interest in the working and living conditions. The minister of trade and tourism Agim Mero thanked the deputy minister of foreign affairs of the Italian Republic, Claudio Vitalone, the Italian people and government for the aids accorded to our country to overcome the difficulties and to implement the reforms. Your aid, he underscored, shows of the renewal of the traditional friendship between the Albanian people and the Italian one.

General Antonio Quintano pointed to the cooperation with the Albanian authorities in carrying out this operation and underscored that it is a mission of peace and solidarity.

The minister of foreign affairs, Muhamet Kapllani, met with the deputy minister of foreign affairs of Italy, Senator Claudio Vitalone, and gave a dinner in his honour.

President Ramiz Alia received the deputy minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Italy, Senator Claudio Vitalone, in his seat on October 16.

In the meeting which proceeded in a warm and friendly atmosphere Senator Claudio Vitalone handed over to President Ramiz Alia a message from the president of the Republic of Italy, Francesco Cossiga, which says among others:

"The visit of the under-secretary of state for foreign affairs Claudio Vitalone to your country affords me the happy occasion to express on behalf of the Italian people a heartfelt greeting and formulate the best wishes for well-being, peace and prosperity for the Albanian people. I am convinced that cooperation between Italy and Albania and the development of cooperation in various fields will consolidate our relations as a factor of peace and stability in the Adriatic region. Thanking you again for the reception extended to me during my short visit to Tirana in August, of which, believe me, I preserve a good impression, I would like to convey to you my most cordial greetings."

President Ramiz Alia thanked for the message and wished that the relations between our countries further develop.

Ylli Bufi, chairman of the Council of Ministers, received on October 16 at the seat of Prime Ministers' Office the deputy foreign minister of the Republic of Italy, Senator Claudio Vitalone, and the persons escorting him. During the meeting they said that the aids the Italian Government has accorded to Albania are very important to overcome the difficulties and to apply the reform.

Premier Ylli Bufi said among others that a still better organization of work on the part of both parties is required for the successful distribution of the Italian aids.

Ylli Cabiri, minister of foreign economic relations, reported on the process of the distribution of Italian aids. It is necessary, he said, to bring simultaneously some commodities from Italy in order to guarantee a regular and quick distribution to the consumer.

On his part, the Italian deputy foreign minister, Claudio Vitalone, expressed the desire of the Italian Government to distribute in time the aids accorded to Albania. He promised to send to Albania some necessary commodities, including here buses.

The Italian deputy foreign minister, Senator Claudio Vitalone, left our country on October 16.

Vitalone Sees Calm at Durres

AU1710111791 Rome ANSA in English 1014 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] (ANSA) Tirana, October 16—Italian Foreign Undersecretary Claudio Vitalone surveyed the distribution of Italian food aid shipped to Albania as calm was restored at the port of Durres, where hundreds of Albanians massed earlier in an attempt to board an Italian ferry, and after incidents were reported at another port where people attempted to storm ships.

Following his arrival Wednesday [16 October], the undersecretary delivered a message to President Ramiz Alia from Italian President Francesco Cossiga and held talks with Prime Minister Ylli Bufi and Foreign Minister Muhamet Kapllani.

Leading [word indistinct) (?for) Albania, Italy has earmarked more than 157 million dollars for the Tirana government not only for aid, said Vitalone, but to help the nation emerge out of its "marginal economy." The Italian official also spoke here of the need for "a [word indistinct] which triggers the ability to revive the Albanian economy" and for "the more widespread involvement of the international community" in these efforts.

Vitalone recalled that "urged by Italy," the European Community has approved the dispatch of food aid with a [word indistinct] of 35 million dollars which will begin arriving [word indistinct] the delivery of Italian foodstuffs worth 89 million dollars."

(?Deliveries of) Italian aid by the end of the month will come to a value of about 24 million dollars and the remainder will arrive in November and December. At present, there are [word indistinct] Italian soldiers at work in Albania on the distribution of this emergency aid [to] 29 provincial centers around the nation.

The undersecretary noted then addition to this assistance are allocations totalling 15.7 million dollars, made following the first Albanian refugee crisis in March. Then, as political unrest and economic distress mounted, up to 30,000 Albanians crossed the Adriatic aboard rusting ferries and freighters and makeshift rafts to reach southern Italian ports.

Another wave of refugees estimated at 20,000 reached Italian ports in early August but were all repatriated within the month. They, said Italian authorities, did not qualify for political refugee status because of the democratic multi-party general elections held in March which returned the communists, renamed the Socialists, to power.

Italy has also opened a credit line of 47 million dollars to facilitate the recovery of Albania's industries and extended nearly 4 million dollars for the purchase of textbooks and equipment to allow schools to embark on the new academic year.

Facing the problem of further mass exoduses towards Italy, Albanian police last night blocked three train-loads of people who arrived in Durres in a bid to board an Italian ferry tied up there. Incidents were also reported in the southwest port of Vlore where police were forced to intervene to prevent access to ships docked there as the Italian ambassador, Torquato Cardilli, spoke to the nation on television to reiterate the Rome government's closed-door policy applied to new flows of refugees.

In Durres, where the port is under the surveillance of Italian naval patrol boats, Vitalone toured the dock area where two Italian freighters were offloading 7,000 tons of wheat, bags of sugar and other items for transport aboard 400 Italian Army trucks.

General Antonio Quintana, the Italian troops' commanding officer, briefed the undersecretary on the logistics of the operation involving local dock workers and transport to the provincial distribution centers over roads which, he said, "severely test the Army trucks." The (?foods are) also airlifted aboard the Army's Ch-47 helicopters.

Islamic Conference Delegation Arrives on Visit

AU1710144791 Tirana ATA in English 1038 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Tirana, October 17 (ATA)—A delegation of the organization of the Islamic Conference and of the World Association of the Islamic Appeal, led by their general secretaries Dr. Hamid al-Gabid and Dr. Muhamed Ahmed al-Sherif, arrived in our country on October 16.

To welcome the delegation at the Rinas Airport were the deputy foreign minister, Ilir Bocka, and other functionaries of the Foreign Ministry. Present was also the chairman of the Albanian Islamic Community, Hafiz Sabri Koci.

Pepa Receives Delegation

AU1710204691 Tirana ATA in English 1907 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Tirana, October 17 (ATA)—On October 17, the deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, Zydi Pepa, received at Premier's Office and had talks with the delegation of the Islamic Conference Organisation, headed by its secretary, Dr. Hamid al-Gabid and of the World Association of Islamic Appeal, headed by its secretary, Dr. Muhamed Ahmed al-Sherif.

Attending the talks were also the minister of construction, Emin Musliu, and the deputy minister of foreign affairs, Ilir Bocka.

The deputy premier, Zydi Pepa spoke to the senior personalities of these Islamic organisation on the ancient friendly relations existing between the Albanian people and Arab ones, relations which have their base on their history as freedom- and peace-loving peoples and thanked them for this visit, voicing their confidence that the relations of cooperation will be strengthened further between Albania and the member countries of these organisations. Then he underlined the importance on establishing diplomatic relations between our country and Arab ones and pointed out that possibilities exist to establish such relation in a near future with Saudi Arabia, etc., for which there is no obstacle on the Albanian Government. Likewise the deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers dwelt on the problem of religion in Albania, stressing that over two-thirds of the population are Moslems. Dwelling upon the Yugoslav crisis, the deputy premier underlined that it cannot be solved without taking into account the lot of over 3 million Albanians residing in their own lands in Yugoslavia, who are also Moslems and suffer under the Serbs' violence.

During the talks, Dr. Hamid al-Gabid and Dr. Muhamed Ahmed al-Sherif thanked for the cordial reception and evaluated the steps undertaken in Albania. They informed of the role of the Islamic Conference Organisation and of the World Association of Islamic Appeal, which conduct their activity in 43 countries in Arabia, Africa, Asia, and Europe. These organisations, they said, enjoy a wide popularity in the Islamic world and have given a way out to all the complex problems of the time. They voiced their readiness to help Albania during the democratic reforms and talked on the ways and possibilities existing to this end as by sending specialists of various fields, or experts in financial questions and on the possibility of opening any joint bank to help investments, on expanding trade, etc. Speaking of the problem of the Albanians in Yugoslavia they said that their question should be solved through understanding and dialogue.

On the same day, the delegation of the Islamic Conference Organisation and of the World Association of Islamic Appeal were received in separate meetings by the minister of culture, youth and sports, Prec Zogaj; by the minister for foreign economic relations, Ylli Cabiri; and the minister of health, Sabit Broka.

The deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, Zydi Pepa, gave a dinner in honour of the delegation of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference and of the World Association of Islamic Appeal, headed by their general secretaries, Dr. Hamid al-Gabid and Dr. Muhamed Ahmed al-Sherif.

Prespa Macedonian Association Holds Conference

AU1710145191 Tirana ATA in English 1045 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Tirana, October 17 (ATA)—The newspaper "PASQYRA" reports that the first conference of the Political Association "Prespa" of the Macedonian minority in Albania was held in Pustec village, Korce District.

Attending the conference were representatives of this association's branches from Berat, Tirana, Elbasan, and Korce. Present were also representatives from Macedonia.

Both the report and contributions made evident that this association is being expanded with each passing day. Some of its members have gone for higher theological studies in Macedonia. Meanwhile, this association has received from the Macedonians residing in Toronto of Canada humanitarian aids with foodstuffs and school materials. Likewise they have presented it with 10 thousand dollars for building schools, churches and cultural environments.

Investigations of Former Leaders Debated

AU1710144491 Tirana ATA in English 1033 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Tirana, October 17 (ATA)—On October 16 before noon, the People's Assembly examined the draft law "On the Bank of Agriculture and Development."

During the examination article per article, the deputies made remarks and proposals, most of which were considered correct and influenced to the improvement of the draft law, which after it was approved article per article, it was adopted in general as well. In the afternoon sitting, an interpolation was demanded by the parliamentary group of the Democratic Party. The chairman of the sitting, Dr. Aleksander Meksi, gave the floor to the chairman of the General Investigation Office, Kristaq Ngjela, who presented the situation on the investigations and abuses of the former senior leadership of the PL [Albanian Workers Party] and the state at the expense of the people's property. He stressed among others the preoccupation of this office to carry out the task it is charged with. So far, he said, about 60 persons have been summoned, 11 have been detained, and 4 of them have been arrested.

The deputies of the Democratic Party made questions and voiced their worry, of the electorate they represent, and of the public opinion in general over sluggishness in investigations. The reply was that the number of investigators is limited, the necessary working conditions are lacking, some of the investigators have been threatened, all these are things which create a psychological pressure. Another question was of whether the decision of the Political Bureau of 1976 for the treatment of the senior leadership of the PL and the state is legitimate, etc.; Petrit Serjani, attorney general, spoke on the control of the legitimacy of these investigation acts.

The assembly will continue in plenary sitting the next Monday, on October 21.

Problems of Army Conditions Examined

AU1710140391 Tirana BASHKIMI in Albanian 11 Oct 91 pp 2-3

[Article by Asllan Bushati: "What Weakens Army Discipline, and How We Will Strengthen It"]

[Text]

1. The Worry

As a Defense Ministry cadre but at the same time a citizen, I have long been worried by the declining military discipline in certain units; the rising number of cases of absence without leave; failures in the performance of military service that have often involved mutilation, self-mutilation, and murder; the bad behavior of certain persons in public places; slovenly dress while in uniform; and desertion. These phenomena are now familiar to the public but are, at the same time, worrying and shocking.

2. Past Mistakes Corrected Today

Certain mistakes regarding the Armed Forces made a quarter of a century ago by decisions of the forums of the Albanian Workers Party's [PPSh] topmost leadership—that is, above all by Enver Hoxha—are now being corrected. These corrections are part of the military reform that is being carried out today but are, at the same time, a demand of the times and vital under a pluralist democracy.

One asks how we in the Army are repairing the gross errors (if we may call them such) made regarding the Armed Forces.

First, let us consider the consequences for the Army of the PPSh Central Committee's Open Letter of 4 March 1966. I think this letter has been and remains, if I may speak figuratively, a "land mine" under the foundations of military discipline, whose consequences we are still suffering a quarter of a century later.

Experience since 1966 shows that the party committees that were put into positions of command and management in the Army did little good (especially after 1974, when this sector's function was enlarged). They not only did not help work to proceed smoothly but also often raised insuperable barriers to the expression of up-to-date, progressive military thinking.

Second, the introduction of commissars led to the dispersal of responsibility for the execution of orders in units, thus creating a lack of discipline and scope for degeneration, dividing command, and, in some cases, encouraging groups, in which some people followed the

orders of the commissar and some the orders of the commandant, which sowed anarchy and chaos.

Thus, the removal of commissars from the Armed Forces has been another correction of the mistakes of the past.

Third, the abolition of ranks and the introduction of a new and unsuitable Chinese-style uniform led to degeneration and did great harm to discipline, whose consequences have still not been repaired.

As has been reported, ranks and new uniforms for cadres will be introduced on 28 November 1991, and it is planned to soon regulate the cut and the characteristics of soldiers' uniforms. This, too, is a correction of the mistakes of the past.

Moreover, I think that some comrades are right when they say that the PPSh Central Committee's Open Letter molded us according to a bad Chinese model, so that we are sorry to see how military uniforms have been spoiled, besides many other things that were introduced a quarter of a century ago.

We are sorry about the many experiments that were conducted on our generation (which dragged on for an appalling 25 years). These "apprentice years" have exhausted us, at a time when the civilized world never allowed itself lengthy experiments of such kinds in its armies. These years were full of events that are worth recalling, but they, above all, represented a time that sowed and unwittingly steadily cultivated apathy, indiscipline, and retrogression in the Army, which were rampant in many areas on the basis of the "Letter of 4 March 1966." In the course of the years, this retrogression took the form of setbacks almost every eight years (think of 1966, 1974, and 1981-82) that eliminated many talented and able cadres.

This process not only created gaps in the succession of the generations but also seriously struck at unity within the Army's ranks. Those who did not harm our work or the homeland's defense or who were unjustly punished are now being rehabilitated.

3. Relations Inverted But Being Corrected

Throughout this quarter-century, the PSSh Central Committee's Open Letter had a very far-reaching effect on the Army. Some basic concepts in the rule book on discipline lost their meaning, including the notions of the Armed Forces, the Army, military discipline, orders, and so forth. Concepts of a purely military character were turned into concepts of an ideological and party political character. Their ideological garb changed their true nature, thus inverting the relation of form to content.

Thus, the rule books on discipline (especially after 1974 and until that in force in 1987) were nothing but a supplement with ideological explanations of military concepts according to the PPSh's ideas, which always placed the party before the homeland.

Likewise, military discipline, instead of being emphasized as a military duty defined by (I stress, defined by) laws, principles, and clearly formulated regulations and as something vital for the performance of tasks in the Army, was clad in an ideological costume and called "a conscious form of behavior...based on a high level of revolutionary awareness." Thus, it was distorted for the sake of ideological postulates.

This influence of ideology on problems of military discipline meant that the relations between the PPSh and the homeland were always turned upside down, and the party and its ideology were always placed before the homeland in the rule book (that currently in force and earlier editions). This phenomenon is now well known, and attention has been drawn to the need to correct it. As a first step, the new rule book has been revised and distributed in the Army for discussion. It is virtually a new book (not a revision) and is based on the experience of developed countries. It has a genuinely military perspective and a broad angle of vision, embracing rights, duties, responsibilities, rewards, and punishments.

The rapid revision of all of our military literature is also planned, which will inevitably lead to a thorough improvement in discipline. This requires that the intellectual and academic potential of cadres who have embraced new ideas, who have studied contemporary literature, and who are talented in this area should be exploited for this literature. I think that cadres in the apparatus of the Defense Ministry and the military academies and cadres who have dealt with academic work should shoulder a major part of the burden here, alongside ordinary personnel.

I emphasize this because we were harmed in the past by a dilettante approach to the preparation and publication of rule books and texts.

4. Economic Conditions Also Have a Bad Influence

Without denying that good work has been done in many units, the Army, in general, still sleeps on straw mattresses and on plank or wire bunks. Many people sleep in one room. Clothes are washed and changed as infrequently as every 10 days. Uniforms and shoes are of poor quality and unsuitable cut, and so forth. Food is still limited to a five to six lek daily allowance and is of limited variety. On one hand, it is admitted that the Army is one of the most difficult fronts in the country's life, but, on the other, living standards are very low even under normal conditions, let alone on field exercises, on work projects, on extended service, and so forth.

This also inevitably influences discipline because individual soldiers illegally seize fruit and vegetables. This is obvious when recruits perform their military service in their home districts, where members of their families bring them food almost every day, which shows that what is supplied by their units is inadequate for their needs.

I do not agree with some specialists who only calculate the number of daily calories, although to my mind these calories, too, are insufficient. The question of Army catering must be considered in a different way from in the past, especially the question of the daily allowance. I emphasize this problem because, in a market economy, the prices of foodstuffs will vary according to supply and demand and according to season, place, and the quantity of food on the market. This means that there will be more serious and complex catering problems than exist today, when we think that a soldier's daily allowance is something fixed.

Economic problems have also exerted a direct influence on the lives of cadres because, in most cases, they have worked 350-900 eight-hour workdays per year. Throughout these lengthy periods of service (for the sake of their service duties), they have been fed on the basis of a soldier's daily allowance (five to six leks) and have always been paid at the minimum rate of their pay scale. Thus, the relationship between their work and their pay, in comparison with that of employees who return to their families and children every evening, together with their many years of service as officers in difficult locations, have burdened them economically and morally, compared with others.

In this context, I wish to emphasize the thoroughly bureaucratic attitude of the former Defense Minister P. Murra, who, although aware of the difficulties of officers' work and their economic grievances and problems, did not in the course of eight years allow an increase in their pay even up to the approved average wage for a job, while he himself, we learn from the press, lived in luxury.

Demoralized by this, certain cadres lowered their standards and began to grow used to the lack of discipline.

Many economic problems are now on the road toward solution following the approval of the Law on the Status of Military Personnel, Structural Amalgamation and Improvements, and the Law on Pay Increases. These measures will inevitably lead to a higher sense of responsibility in cadres' enforcement of discipline.

5. What Should We Correct Soon, and How?

Seen in all its complexity, it goes without saying that all these problems I have mentioned, together with the problems of the geographical distribution (subdivision) of units throughout our territory and of long periods of military service within one's district, lead to a lower level of discipline and create conditions for exceptional events and absences without leave, to the point of the exodus of certain soldiers.

In short, they do harm. But this is not fatal.

The times have now greatly changed, and these changes are in a positive direction. The important thing is for us to act on a simple motto: Let us abandon what was mistaken, let us clarify what was confused, and let us straighten and repair what was distorted with our labor, effort, and sweat because the homeland needs the Armed Forces just as a human being needs air, water, food, and clothing.

Some people cannot let go of the past and others adopt avant garde positions at the other extreme. Some people try to hoist party flags and some try to create dictatorships of the kind we are now burying. All of these people may pretend to be heralds of the new age, paragons of justice, harbingers of innovation and democracy, and so forth. In fact, I think they are extremists aiming at dictatorships of various kinds. They call themselves supporters of the Constitution, the laws, and the rule book, but they, in fact, favor a state and Army without laws.

I think that this contingent should be told bluntly that the Army is the people's. It came from the people, belongs to the people, and is created solely by the people. The Army symbolizes national unity in the reality of today, beyond political parties and beyond regional loyalties but under the command of the president of the Republic and the Defense Ministry leadership. It will fulfill its mission in accordance with the Constitution. We therefore call on you to join these currents of thought before it is too late.

We will frankly tell the contingent of soldiers who have taken absence without leave and who continue to absent themselves that they have embarked on a path of crime. We have laws, and the laws condemn them, but society is not interested in depriving them of their freedom. Therefore, as a first step, return to your units as soon as possible. The commander will extend your military service by as many days as you were absent, and it is up to you to erase the blame accruing to you by your work.

As for the soldiers who have deserted and fled as refugees to neighboring countries, we call on you, through your families, the Foreign Ministry, and the organizations with ties to these states, to return. Otherwise, we warn you that the laws recognized and accepted by international justice, which are valid for soldiers, too, will be enforced.

I think that this process in which we are engaged demands an entirely new concept of all-around work to enforce discipline, as well as faster work to approve the law on military service and to prepare bills that stem from the Law on the Status of Military Personnel.

I also think that it is necessary to accelerate work on approving a new disciplinary rule book. This will not only meet the demands of the times in a law-governed state but will also be a strong weapon in the hands of staff commands, including everything that is necessary to tighten discipline, from expressions of thanks and moral and material rewards to reprimands and serious forms of arrest when breaches of discipline require punishment.

Central Electoral Commission on Latest Results

AU1610183991 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network in Bulgarian 1600 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Interview with Ganeta Minkova, official spokesman and deputy chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, by Khristo Khristov, following a news conference at the People's Palace of Culture in Sofia on 16 October—recorded]

[Text] [Khristov] Mrs. Minkova, what are the latest results you can report to our listeners?

[Minkova] The latest partial results are already known, but I will repeat them: 34.48 percent for the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS]; 33.08 percent for the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP]; and 7.44 for the Movement of Rights and Freedoms Movement [DPS]. These are the three parties that will take part in the distribution of parliamentary seats. All the other parties have not reached the 4 percent minimum.

[Khristov] Are there any parties that did not receive even one vote?

[Minkova] Yes, there are such parties. One of them, for example, is the Social Radical Democratic Party of the Constitutional Forum Political Club, but that organization has not registered any candidates' lists for participation in the parliamentary elections. In addition to that, the Party of Property Owners in Bulgaria and the Free Democratic Party did not receive any votes. However, it is a question of percentages that are calculated on a nationwide basis, which means that they may have received a certain number of votes, but, in comparison with the total number of votes, they do not obtain any percentages.

[Khristov] As far as the independent candidates are concerned, whose candidacy was widely discussed prior to the elections, what percentages have they obtained, and have some of them obtained a substantial number of votes?

[Minkova] According to unconfirmed facts, the district electoral commissions are expected to establish which independent candidate has won, and, according to preliminary data, as I said, it seems that none of the independent candidates will obtain a seat.

[Khristov] That is already known. Have any protocols been annulled, have there been drastic violations the Central Electoral Commission has to deal with?

[Minkova] We are just receiving the protocols from the district electoral commission and from the polling stations for the legislative elections. So far, I think that no serious infringements have occurred.

[Khristov] Have any protocols been annulled?

[Minkova] There have been no such annulments; nevertheless, I think that some questions may be subsequently submitted to discussion in case some violations have occurred.

[Khristov] Could you provide some figures on the real number of votes cast in the country?

[Minkova] Yes, there were 6,432,679 votes cast.

Results of Election Analyzed in Detail

AU1710205091 Sofia BTA in English 1449 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Report by Khristina Gulubova: "October 13 Elections: Ins and Outs"]

[Text] Sofia, October 17—Bulgarians voted for democracy on October 13. The Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) came out first and emerged as the principal opponent of the Bulgarian Socialist (formerly Communist) Party (BSP) which ruled the country in the last 46 years.

In less than a year and a half, Bulgaria held two democratic elections.

The number of valid votes on October 13 was about five and a half million, which is 600,000 less than in the 1990 elections. A member of the team processing this year's data believes there should not be an appreciable difference between the number of valid votes in the two elections. It is not clear how so many votes proved invalid. After last year's elections, mathematicians claimed the ballot was rigged by half a million ghost voters.

On October 13, the BSP received about one million less votes. The SDS retained its electorate. The Bulgarian Agrarian Party-United (BZNS-E) lost half of its votes and remained outside parliament. The Movement for Rights and Freedoms (DPS) is again the third largest force in parliament.

Characteristically, some 25 percent of the voters in this year's elections opted for small parties and coalitions and independent candidates none of which and whom, however, made it to parliament.

Analysing the distribution of votes by constituency, Mr. Dimitur Topliyski, member of the Central Electoral Commission, finds the most interesting swing in the vote of the BSP which last year won more than 50 percent of the seats. The BSP retains its last year's performance in only two of the 31 constituencies (Burgas and Kurdzhali). In almost all other constituencies its voter support dropped between 10 and 20 percent, and in three constituencies, Kyustendil, Turgovishte and Dobrich, the decline is over 20 percent.

The SDS obtained a result similar to last year's in the constituencies of Burgas, Vratsa, Kurdzhali, Pernik, Plovdiv, Smolyan, the city of Sofia, the region of Sofia and Shumen.

Between 1 and 4 percent more people voted SDS in Blagoevgrad, Gabrovo, Dobrich, Kyustendil, Pazardzhik and Silistra. The largest increase of the SDS vote (5 percent) was registered in Mikhailovgrad. In the rest of the constituencies, electoral support for the SDS dropped between 1 and 4 percent, the largest decrease (5 percent) being in Turgovishte.

Mr. Topliyski said that the Movement for Rights and Freedoms did not only retain but increased its electorate in its traditional strongholds: northeastern Bulgaria and Kurdzhali, southern Bulgaria. According to him, the 8 percent increase in Smolyan is due to the recruitment of electorate from the Pomak (ethnic Bulgarian Mohammedan) population in the area.

On the strength of these results, of the 38 parties and coalitions which took part in the elections only the SDS, the BSP and the DPS will constitute the new parliament. The allocation of seats by the d'Hondt method is 110 for the SDS, 106 for the BSP and 24 for the DPS but is inconclusive as it is based only on the processing of the data feed from the polling district commissions while the actual tally sheets have yet to be processed.

The newcomers to parliament include SDS leader Mr. Filip Dimitrov, the poetess Mrs. Blaga Dimitrova and the Rev. Khristofor Subev, both from the same coalition. Two thirds of the SDS MP's [members of parliament] will be new people. Of last year's composition, the leaders of the Radical Democratic Party Mr. Aleksandur Yordanov, Prof. Elka Konstantinova and Mr. Mikhail Nedelchev, Deputy Prime Minister Dimitur Ludzhev, Finance Minister Ivan Kostov and Industry and Trade Minister Ivan Pushkarov and Democratic Party Leader Stefan Savov will probably keep their seats.

The Socialists will be represented again by long-serving parliamentarians like the BSP leader Mr. Aleksandur Lilov (four terms of office), former Prime Minister Andrey Lukanov (four terms), Mr. Georgi Pirinski, Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandur Tomov, the BSP floor leader in the previous parliament Mrs. Nora Ananieva, Mr. Yanaki Stoilov, Mrs. Elena Poptodorova and Ms. Velislava Dureva.

The DPS leader Mr. Ahmed Dogan will also remain in parliament.

Bokov Comments on Zhelev's Support for BSP

AU1710125291 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 12 Oct 91 p 2

[Report by Dora Chichkova: "President Zhelev Is Reportedly a Socialist"]

[Text] After we learned that we have a Socialist king, we are rejoicing at the fact that our president is a Socialist, Filip Bokov, spokesman of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP], stated at a news briefing held in the International Press Center of the National Palace of Culture on 11 October.

With his address published the other night, the president exhorted the voters to elect the BSP. It was precisely the BSP that guaranteed civic peace over the past two years, the party that did not promote or engage in any extra-legislative activities, that did not set buildings on fire and did not attack members of parliament, Filip Bokov pointed out.

Nevertheless, as supporters of a pluralistic multicolored political life, the Socialists have their reservations about the president's efforts to influence the voters by advising them not to vote for certain other parties, the speaker added.

The BSP will recognize the elections immediately after the competent organs have announced the results, Aleksandur Lilov declared at the same news briefing. The BSP will propose a coalition in case of its victory.

Aleksandur Lilov is unwilling to commit himself with forecasts for the election results. We shall try not to win more than 70 percent because we are afraid that we may be accused of manipulations, Filip Bokov promised.

The BSP is convinced that it does not matter which independent institution is the first to announce its forecasts. The important thing is to work honestly and in a professional manner. That is what Lyubomir Kyuchukov and Apostol Dimitrov, deputy chairmen of the BSP Supreme Council, stated on the occasion. A parallel counting of votes for the purpose of control should take place under all circumstances, they added.

President Zhelev Denies Being Socialist

AU1710125891 Sofia TRUD in Bulgarian 14 Oct 91 p 1

[Report by Dimitur Statkov]

[Text] A little after 1000, President Zhelev, accompanied by his wife and two daughters, walked from his home to the No. 60 polling station of the 24th Electoral District in the Sofia Sredets Municipality. Following this, he waited in line for his turn, despite the numerous invitations addressed to him by the public to move to the front of the line. This was a splendid opportunity for the journalists present to interview him. In reply to the statement of a ROMPRES correspondent: "According to the daily DUMA, you are a Socialist," the president answered in decent French: "I am not a Socialist; I am a democrat." There were also some questions and answers in English, but the Bulgarian journalists were the most inquisitive ones. Mr. Zhelev expressed his hope for future understanding between the political forces and for prompt integration with the European institutions. He

declared that he had not yet decided whether he should run for the next presidential election, and that this did not depend on him alone. The president excluded the possibility that the election results may not be recognized, which would be "somewhat shocking" in view of the current control, he said. In answer to a question from a TRUD reporter about whether he would prefer to vote for personalities rather than for parties and about his forecast, the president declared that the majority system would be appropriate for a more consolidated democracy and that, because last year (in a TRUD interview) he failed in his forecasts about the election results, he no longer wishes to commit himself.

SDS Legislative Group News Conference Reported

AU1610183391 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network in Bulgarian 1600 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] This afternoon, the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] Parliamentary Group gave a news conference in Sofia. Mr. Aleksandur Yordanov, deputy chairman of the SDS Coordinating Council, spoke on the first legislative activities of the SDS in the coming National Assembly.

Vasil Gotsev announced that a bill on the restitution of the property illegally seized by the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP], or property belonging to the BSP for which there is no proof it was obtained from members' contributions should be discussed.

The SDS legislative group also intends to submit a bill on amending the Law on the Land, a new bill on foreign investments, and a bill on privatization that envisages the restitution of the existing property to its former owners, while the rest should be compensated for in the process of privatization.

Vasil Gotsev drew attention to the necessity of amending some laws related to social welfare.

Evgeni Mikhaylov, deputy chairman of the SDS Central Electoral Club, expressed his concern about the ethnic hatred that certain newspapers—DUMA, in particular—have been fanning recently.

The SDS submitted a request to the Central Electoral Commission today asking for full information on the question of why certain protocols were sent back by the Central Electoral Commission and what the corrections added to them were.

If no answer should follow, the issue will be submitted to the legal organs.

Postelectoral Declaration of BSP Presidium

AU1710132391 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 15 Oct 91 p 1

[Declaration of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Bulgarian Socialist Party; date not given: "There is No Place for Dramatizing the Situation. No Despondency!"]

[Text] Dear socialists, sympathizers, and Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] voters:

On 13 October and until late into the early hours of 14 October, elections for the National Assembly, municipal counselors, and mayors were held. From preliminary incomplete forecasts, it appears that the BSP has polled approximately 33 percent of the vote, which will mean approximately 40 percent of the mandates in the National Assembly. This means that, if the preliminary forecasts are confirmed, the SDS will have the most members in the future legislature, albeit without an absolute majority and with a small lead. Even if it turns out that the BSP will not participate in the next government, it will be a fundamental and reliable guarantor of civic peace, the Constitution, and the democratic changes.

The count continues and it can change the preliminary forecasts. At the end of the week, when the Central Electoral Commission announces the final results, the Supreme Party Council will make a full analysis and draw the necessary conclusions from the preparations for and results of the elections just held.

What can be said now, a few hours after the elections have finished?

First, the Presidium of the Supreme Party Council extends its warm thanks to all who put their faith in and lent their support to the BSP platform and candidates. That is the vote of a large part of the nation, and the Bulgarian Socialists value exceptionally highly the faith shown in us. We will do everything to justify it.

In addition, the Bulgarian Socialist Party emerges from these elections as the biggest and most influential political party in Bulgaria. Its position as a fundamental political factor in the democratic processes in Bulgaria has not changed. That is a fundamental fact and cannot be underestimated by anybody. Today in the Republic of Bulgaria a larger and more influential party does not exist.

Comrades, friends, there is no place for dramatizing the situation. No fear. No losing heart. No despondency. Now the party and its allies must concentrate on the second round of the mayoral elections. The BSP and its legislative union have a fundamental and very important role to play in the future National Assembly.

We will recognize whatever election result the voters have determined. We will fulfill the role of a strong and constructive opposition, if we become that, that has no more important aim than the development of a democratic Bulgaria.

That is why the most important thing now is to begin work immediately on fulfilling our election campaign platform and the alternative contained in it: civic peace, social defense, national accord, production revival, personal and national security, law and order. We shall be

an irreconcilable force against unemployment, profiteering, and large-scale impoverishment.

Heads up, dear comrades! Under conditions of legislative democracy, the alternation of parties in power is something normal. Now the democratism of the parties and state institutions is being put to the test, not only in words but also in action. We shall continue to be a constructive political force. The BSP is a wise and strong party that has undergone deep changes. It can neither be crushed by force nor sidetracked from its reform of society and of itself as a modern left-wing party of European-type socialist ideas.

The vote counting has not finished. The final results are still not known. The Central Electoral Commission will announce them officially in the next few days. Until then, our representatives engaged in the election process must continue to carry out their duties in order to guarantee the democratism, lawfulness, and honesty of the elections.

We appeal to all Socialists and voters to attend work for the good of Bulgaria, the strengthening of civic peace, and the country's emergence from the severe economic crisis. Bulgaria is now in need of stability and efforts to resolve the acute problems that are ahead of it and the large majority of Bulgarian citizens.

The Presidium of the BSP Supreme Council

BSP Claims 55 Percent in Local Elections

AU1710181891 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network in Bulgarian 1500 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Report by Nina Spasova]

[Text] At a news conference held today by the election alliance of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP], the latest figures were given on the local election results according to the parallel count being made by BSP experts.

It was stated that, in the elections for municipal mayors, about 55 percent of the mayors elected so far represent the BSP, 25.2 percent belong to the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS], about 18 percent represent the Rights and Freedoms Movement [DPS], and so on.

The figures for mayors of towns and villages are similar: 52 percent of those elected represent the BSP, 18.9 percent the DPS, 11.7 the SDS, 10.1 the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union-United, and 4.3 percent the Nikola Petkov BZNS. In the elections for councillors, the difference between the parties is closer, but, according to the compiled data, the relationship between the BSP and the SDS is 38 to 31 percent.

The news conference also announced the legislative intentions of the BSP election alliance. Velko Vulkanov showed a list of over 50 laws that the Socialists plan to submit to the National Assembly. They include laws on property, privatization, the restitution of property, employment, the press, radio, television, the BTA, and so on.

In the opinion of Georgi Pirinski, priority must undoubtedly be given to the privatization act and the law on banking and credit because those are most directly connected with the restructuring of the economy. Mr. Pirinski declared that the privatization act, although it had been ready for a long time, was not adopted by the old legislature not because the majority wanted that but because the interested SDS members of parliament prevented its progress, giving priority to restitution of property before privatization.

The Socialists see no need for changes in the Land Act, the Law on Foreign Investments, and the Audit Office Act but object to certain clauses in the already adopted National Education Act and to amendments to the Pensions Act, which creates new privileges. Furthermore, Velko Vulkanov stated his personal view that changes are needed in the Law on Personal Names, insisting on the restoration to surnames of the Bulgarian suffix -ev.

Postelection Coalition Scenarios, DPS Role

AU1710145691 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 15 Oct 91 p 6

[Article by Plamen Enchev: "A Shade of Turkish Blue Is Shining Through the Dimness of a Dark Blue Cabinet"]

[Text] The fish is still swimming in the water, but the frying pan is already on the stove. Our country's future in the coming months and years will depend on who gets the fish on his hook.

If the initial preliminary election results are confirmed by the official ones, which the Central Electoral Commission is expected to announce within the next few days, the president of the Republic will entrust the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] with forming a new government. Is is not yet clear when this might happen, but the people at Rakovski 134 [SDS headquarters] are already making their plans. The SDS is in the process of preparing the future cabinet, Filip Dimitrov, leader of the union, announced yesterday. He is presumably expected to head the new cabinet, but the names of Dimitur Ludzhev and Ivan Kostov have also been mentioned.

The future legislature is expected to appear in blue-red-Turkish blue shades, as a political observer appropriately described it. This, however, is likely to make things difficult for the people in charge of forming the government, which has to be approved by more than half of the future legislature members. As far as the problems concerning the course of the economic reforms are concerned, their discussion seems to have been postponed.

If the SDS does form a government, we may expect that ministers representing the so-called Bulgarian Turks will be appointed for the first time in our country's history. That is what some people think. They even refer to a speech delivered by Ahmed Dogan, leader of the Movement for Rights and Freedoms [DPS], at an election rally, when he disclosed his aspiration for the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Nevertheless, it is also a well-known fact that Stoyan Ganev has some ambitions toward the department in question, so that some new moves may be expected from the "Bulgarian Kennedy."

It is not yet clear whether a future coalition with the DPS may be agreed upon under certain conditions granted to the representatives of Turkish blue. However, this would be a hairbreadth cabinet and, under any circumstances, a cabinet that is hardly likely to enjoy the support of the majority of the Bulgarian people, as sources close to the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] claim.

The numerous uncertainties surrounding the unfortunate 4-percent limit determining the access of the political "center" formations to the legislature prevent observers from forecasting whether the SDS would propose a coalition to the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union-United [BZNS-United], for example. Filip Dimitrov, however, unmistakably declared that both BZNS parties would be welcome in a future legislature, where a fragile majority is expected to prevail.

Other observers admit the possibility of another option—namely, that the SDS would form its own government with the silent support of the DPS.

If, nonetheless, the dark blue group fails to form a cabinet, the task should be entrusted to the BSP. The Socialists are firmly resolved that any coalition with the DPS would be out of the question for them. Under such circumstances, everything will depend on the question of whether other parties overcome the 4-percent barrier and, if this happens, whether the BSP would try to form a government with the participation of the light blue formations [SDS-Center and SDS-Liberals] or with the Agrarian Unions. Nevertheless, even such a future cabinet is preceded by numerous "ifs."

A caretaker cabinet, based on the confidence of the legislature and elected for a certain period of time—let us say for 100 days—in charge of a specific program, would also be a possibility. However, it is likely to encounter infinitely greater difficulties than the present Dimitur Popov government, political observers think.

DPS Favors Legislative Coalition With SDS

AU1710205891 Sofia BTA in English 2030 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Sofia, October 17 (BTA)—"In parliament the SDS and the DPS will form a very good coalition and will do their best to make parliament work efficiently. We have yet to decide whether the DPS will enter the government or will only form a parliamentary coalition with the SDS," Mr. Yunal Lyutfi, spokesman for the ethnic Turks' Movement for Rights and Freedoms (DPS), said on national radio today.

Asked about his statement for the ANATOLIA News Agency that the DPS claims a deputy prime ministership and other ministerial portfolios, Mr. Lyufti explained that the statement had been made without consulting the SDS. The DPS leadership met with the SDS leadership only once and have not yet discussed any details. Such talks will be held shortly.

The DPS platform and objectives are very close to those of the SDS, and therefore they can form a parliamentary coalition, Mr. Lyutfi said.

Mr. Lyutfi assesses the election results as a historic victory of the democratic forces in general, the DPS included.

Agrarians Protest Lateness of Election Results

AU1710125391 Sofia ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME in Bulgarian 14 Oct 91 p 1

["Declaration of the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union-United Permanent Board," issued in Sofia on 13 October]

[Text] The Permanent Board of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union-United [BZNS-United] is extremely alarmed by the statement of the Central Election Commission, according to which the final election results will be announced on 23 October—that is, 10 days after the elections.

There is no such precedent in world practice, and we are surprised at the Central Election Commission's attitude toward this exceptionally important issue.

Why is such a delay necessary, and who needs it? Ten days is a period of time that allows for even greater manipulation of the election results.

We appeal to all political forces to support our protest and oblige the Central Election Commission to announce the final election results within a maximum of two to three days of the 13 October elections.

BZNS-United To Consider 'Disastrous Performance'

AU1710210091 Sofia BTA in English 2022 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Commentary by BTA: "Post-Election Resignations?"]

[Text] Sofia, October 17 (BTA)—Next week the leadership of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party (United) (BZNS-U) will consider the reasons for the party's disastrous performance in the elections where it failed to reach the required 4 per cent minimum and remained outside

parliament, although it was considered a major political force and a desirable political partner by different political circles.

The BZNS (United) is headed by Mr. Tsenko Barev who returned from emigration in France in July. Some of the leaders of the former official Agrarian Party, which ruled together with the Communist Party in totalitarian times, kept their jobs in the leadership.

Several days ago the BZNS branch in Varna demanded an extraordinary meeting of the party's leadership. For the first time the leaders were blamed for the loss. Before the elections the leaders used to say that the BZNS would be the ruling party and the only one capable of leading Bulgaria out of the crisis. The BZNS turned down numerous proposals for election coalitions and finally coalesced with the small Constitutional Forum which unites mainly intellectuals.

Mr. Milan Drenchev, leader of the Nikola Petkov Bulgarian Agrarian Party, feels no guilt for his party's defeat. A month before the elections his party broke away from the SDS and also failed to collect the required minimum of the votes.

The Socialist, formerly Communist, Party is to hold a plenum and a congress. There is some talk that the conflict between reformers (Aleksandur Lilov is considered to be one of them) and radicals is entering its decisive phase. Many observers predict that Aleksandur Lilov, one of Todor Zhivkov's close associates in the 70's, will be replaced.

The SDS Centre and SDS Liberals, which also broke away from the SDS, have not yet mentioned meetings on personnel changes.

Changes are expected, however, in the Confederation of Independent Trade Unions which openly backed the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party in the election campaign. Its leadership is to hold a meeting tomorrow.

Commentary on National Assembly Seat Distribution

AU1610181291 Sofia BTA in English 1656 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Commentary by BTA correspondent Khristina Gulubova: "Who Won't Get Into Parliament?"]

[Text] Sofia, October 16 (BTA)—The two agrarian parties—the Bulgarian Agrarian Party (United) (BZNS United) and the Nikola Petkov BZNS—the UDF [Union of Democratic Forces] Centre and UDF Liberals lost the October 13 elections although it was their ambition not only to keep their presence in parliament, but to win an ampler representation in it.

The BZNS United, whose predecessor ruled the country side by side with the Communists in the last 45 years, stood the greatest chance of getting into parliament. Last year the Bulgarian Agrarian Party won 16 seats but now it is 0.15 percent short of the 4-percent minimum required for participation in the distribution of seats. Uniting with part of the Nikola Petkov BZNS and having distanced itself from its former partners, the BZNS United hoped to poll more than 20 percent of the vote in this year's elections.

The Bulgarian Agrarian Party was founded one hundred years ago and has been an active participant in the country's political life. From 1919 through 1923 Bulgaria was ruled by an all-Agrarian cabinet. The Agrarian Party split after 1946 when the Communists crushed the opposition. The then Agrarian leader Nikola Petkov was killed and his supporters had to go underground. Many of them left this country. Part of the Agrarians collaborated with the Communists.

The Nikola Petkov BZNS, which ran on the list of the Union of Democratic Forces in last year's elections and won 29 seats, left the UDF a little before the election campaign was launched and decided to run on its own list but failed to poll the required 4-percent minimum of the vote.

Similar is the fate of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party (BSDP), the basic force in the UDF Centre. The BSDP is also 100 years old. It was outlawed after 1946. It was revived after the totalitarian regime was overthrown in 1989 and became one of the founders of the opposition Union of Democratic Forces.

The BSDP had 23 seats in the Grand National Assembly. Later on the BSDP split from the UDF, forming a coalition with part of Ecoglasnost and the Democratic Party-Plovdiv. The UDF Centre polled a little more than 3 percent of the vote, although in some constituencies it went over the required minimum of 4 percent.

The UDF Liberals coalition was formed by part of the Green Party and that part of the Federation of Democracy Clubs which some time ago split from the radical opposition. They were also among the founders of the UDF. The coalition polled less than 3 percent of the vote.

The UDF Centre and UDF Liberals failed to reach an agreement on forming an election alliance. On the eve of elections they admitted their mistake and signed an agreement on parliamentary cooperation after the elections, but it cannot help them now.

The following political figures will not be returned: Petur Dertliev, leader of the BSDP; Petur Kornazhev; Angel Akhryanov; Petur Beron, UDF former leader; Aleksandur Karakachanov, founder of the Green Party; Petko Simeonov, leader of the Federation of Democracy Clubs; Viktor Vulkov, deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs; Boris Spirov, minister of agriculture; Ivan Glushkov, deputy chairman of the Grand National Assembly; Ginyo Ganev, deputy chairman of the Grand National Assembly who ran in the elections as an independent candidate; Rumen Vodenicharov, former leader of the Independent Human Rights Society

who also ran as an independent candidate; and Yosif Petrov, a colourful personality and the doyen of the Grand National Assembly.

Parties Give Briefings on New Legislature

AU1710193791 Sofia BTA in English 1859 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Sofia, October 17 (BTA)—Bulgaria hopes last Sunday's election defeat for the Communists will remove hurdles to negotiations on its 11-billion-dollar foreign debt, chief Bulgarian debt negotiator Mariana Todorova told REUTER today. In her opinion, the creditors hold up agreements on debt rescheduling, waiting for the results of the elections in Bulgaria. The Bulgarian delegation will meet the creditor banks in November although it was not possible to say when a final agreement would be reached, REUTER said. The banks have granted Bulgaria a series of 90-day deferrals, Ms. Todorova explained. She added that one option in any final debt package with the banks would be debt-equity swaps.

The SDS [Union of Democratic Forces], the leading political force in the future parliament, will be represented by a single parliamentary group, probably headed by the chairman of the National Coordinating Council, deputy chairman Aleksandur Yordanov told a press conference today. That could imply that if the present SDS leader Filip Dimitrov is asked to form the new cabinet, he would resign as leader of the coalition. It is still unclear whether the SDS will hurry to form a new cabinet. Both before and after the elections the SDS has been supporting Mr. Dimitur Popov's cabinet, Mr. Yordanov pointed out.

The Movement for Rights and Freedoms (DPS) has no claims on the Ministry of the Interior, Mr. Osman Oktay, secretary of the DPS, told "DEMOKRATSIYA '91" today. He also said that the DPS has not yet discussed its possible claims on ministerial portfolios. He believes that a government without DPS representatives is possible but the movement's participation in executive power will be a stabilizing factor.

The BSP will move a package of 80 bills in parliament, the bills have been worked out by the party's experts, it was announced at the Socialists' press conference today. According to the BSP, the future parliament should prioritize the bills related to the economic reform and other urgent problems like crime and national security. Mr. Georgi Pirinski pointed out that the bills on privatization, banking and crediting should be debated first.

If privatization does not start in three weeks, it might never start, experts of the Bulgarian Association for a Stable Economy warned at a press conference today. The association advocates the Rahn-Utt economic strategy.

Defense Minister Views Army's Role in Elections

AU1610161791 Sofia BULGARSKA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 11 Oct 91 pp 1, 3

[Article by Defense Minister General Yordan Mutafchiev: "The Army and the Elections"]

[Excerpts] Our country is at the threshold of the second elections in the period of transition from a totalitarian to a democratic society. We are witnessing a sharp struggle between political parties and coalitions trying to win the voters' confidence.

Particular attention is devoted to the problems of national security, problems involving the Army and the country's defense in discussions, meetings, and rallies of the election campaign and in various press organs. In our extremely politicized society, the Armed Forces could not avoid being affected by the current storms of the election struggle. Therefore, we, the Army leadership, want this current to be refreshing rather than destructive, to accelerate the processes of reform and consolidate the Army's prestige and the self-confidence and social status of the commanding staff. The efforts of our commanders and officers of all grades, the efforts of the entire Army community are focused on these goals and tasks. In this respect, we are enjoying the substantial support and assistance of the state leadership and the leaders of major political forces. [passage omitted]

The leadership of the Ministry of Defense, after consulting Army personnel from all units and subunits, submitted certain justified proposals on the participation of Army personnel in elections, which were included in the Electoral Law. The innovation introduced in the aforementioned law is that the conscripts will vote only for National Assembly deputies, but not in special polling stations installed for only them. They are expected to vote together with other citizens at the nearest polling stations. The right of conscripts to be elected and to elect municipal councillors and mayors is restricted. As far as the commanding staff—namely, officers and sergeants—are concerned, they are entitled to run for the National Assembly, for the posts of municipal councillors, and for mayors only as independent candidates.

The Electoral Law banned all election campaign propaganda from the barracks and entitled the minister of defense, in cooperation with the Central Electoral Commission, to determine the procedures according to which soldiers should get acquainted with the programs of the respective parties and candidates. These innovations are essential, and, despite the fact that they restrict some human rights, they are necessary at this stage of development because they are aimed at preserving the Army from the bias of partisan struggles and unnecessary politicization likely to disturb the performance of the daily tasks aimed at promoting combat readiness and the soldiers' moral-political training. [passage omitted]

An exceptionally important requirement for commanders and public institutions is that they should not permit any manipulation or indoctrination whatsoever to be exerted upon the conscience of the conscripts by the commanding staff, so that every soldier may have the opportunity to make his own choice and to cast his vote according to his conscience.

Reliable guarantees should be provided for the soldiers and for the young conscripts, in particular, so that their votes should be dictated by their own consciences alone and so that, in case their choices should not coincide with those of their commanders or some other superiors, their service would suffer no negative consequences. That is a very important question to which great attention was paid. It occupies not only the minds of the Army community; political parties and coalitions, representatives of social organizations, and the group of international observers also devoted great attention to it. Several units of the Bulgarian Army were inspected. We are pleased to point out that no actions whatsoever in favor of one or the other political force were established, that no "secret" instructions were disclosed. This fact confirms the real transformation of the Army, the real democratic changes that have been implemented. [passage omitted]

The political forces definitely earned great credit for the peaceful atmosphere within the Army during the election campaign. Hardly any manipulation for winning the soldiers' votes was established during the current election campaign. Certain individual cases of biased and untruthful articles written about the Army and the commanding staff have occurred, but that is evidently inevitable in our epoch. The benevolent attitude of the political leaders and parties toward the Bulgarian Army can be explained by several circumstances. In our opinion, the most important of them is that our Army is the only one in the Balkans today that is not soiled by the blood of its own people. The positive attitude toward the Army is also a result of the great changes that have occurred over the past two years in the crucial spheres of military organization and activities.

On Sunday, 13 October, every soldier will cast his vote in the ballot box and thus exercise his right to vote. This opportunity is provided for every member of the Army personnel.

There is no doubt that our soldiers will vote with the confidence that the new National Assembly, at one of its first sessions, will discuss and pass the bill on defense and the bill on the Armed Forces, and that the legislature will approve a government capable of overcoming the crisis in our country and of solving the urgent problems facing the Army.

The Bulgarian Army does not take sides in the elections. Its stand on the results of the elections is unbiased. The participation of Army personnel in the elections is not only an opportunity to exercise one's constitutional right to vote but also an opportunity to convince the political forces and the public that the processes of depoliticization and democratization that are the core of military reforms in the Army are genuinely successful and have marked substantial progress.

Irrespective of the forthcoming election results, the Bulgarian Army is expected to come out of the elections with new opportunities for its development as a modern, contemporary army, as a reliable guarantor of peaceful transition to democracy, and as a guarantor for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Bulgaria.

Ludzhev Interviewed on Turkish Minority

NC1710121291 Istanbul CUMHURIYET in Turkish 11 Oct 91 p 11

["Exclusive" interview with Dimitur Ludzhev, deputy prime minister of Bulgaria, by CUMHURIYET correspondent Yasemin Congar in Sofia; date not given]

[Text] Sofia—[Congar] The Bulgarian Government on 16 September obstructed teaching the Turkish language to Turkish students in state schools. How will this problem be resolved after the elections?

[Ludzhev] The policy of the radical wing of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS], which I represent, is very clear. We fully support the recognition of all the rights of the Bulgarian citizens of Turkish origin. That they should learn their own language is their primary right. We support the idea of teaching the Turkish language in state schools. We will provide this if we are able to establish the government after the elections.

[Congar] The radical wing, which you represent, has been described as having a good chance in the elections. What are your chances of coming to power alone? Would you establish a coalition with the Movement for Rights and Freedoms [DPS], which has been established by the Turkish population in Bulgaria?

[Ludzhev] The latest public opinion polls have indicated that we may either emerge as the leading party or become one of the largest groups in the National Assembly. If we become the leading party, we shall try to establish the government alone. If not, we shall move to establish a coalition with the other parties, but not with the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP]. It is not time to make a final decision on whether or not we should establish a coalition with the DPS. This matter will be considered after the elections.

[Congar] How would the SDS's coming to power either by itself or through a coalition affect Bulgaria's policy toward Turkey?

[Ludzhev] Bulgaria adopted a peaceful foreign policy after Zhelyu Zhelev became president. The SDS radical wing wishes to remove all of the matters that cause tension between Bulgaria and Turkey. We will try to realize the requirements for recognizing the cultural,

social, and religious rights of the Bulgarian citizens who are of Turkish origin. Meanwhile, a number of arrangements may be required to remove military anxieties in Bulgaria and eastern Thrace.

[Congar] Your government, headed by Prime Minister Popov, has achieved a rapprochement between Bulgaria and Greece. Do you believe Bulgaria can take similar steps toward Turkey?

[Ludzhev] If we become a strong partner of the government, we definitely will move to establish political cooperation with Turkey. We will move to sign a friendship, cooperation, and security agreement with Turkey similar to the one we signed with Greece. We will do everything we can to have this agreement signed early in 1992.

Purchase of Monitoring Systems for Kozloduy Queried

AU1610150791 Sofia OTECHESTVEN VESTNIK in Bulgarian 11 Oct 91 p 2

[Article by Khristo Karlukovski: "Darkness Prevails Around the Kozloduy Nuclear Power Plant"]

[Text] We know that all manner of events occur at the nuclear electric power plant. One hears first of strikes, then of threats of radioactive radiation in excess of the permissible norms, then of the risk of millions of Bulgarian homes being plunged into darkness and cold during the winter. The topic of the nuclear power plant has become part of the repertoire of the political forces and our relations with other states.

It is clear that problems do exist, and it is true that ways are being sought to eliminate them. However, precisely at this juncture, some people are playing games that at least for the present are hidden in obscurity.

What am I talking about? In the considered assessment of international organizations like the International Atomic Energy Agency and the World Association of Nuclear Organizations, monitoring systems have to be fitted in the so-called first circuit of the four WWER-440 generating units. After these systems have been installed, the four units can produce electric power. The systems are of three types: an acoustic system to monitor the early detection of leaks in the first circuit; a vibrational system to monitor the cooling pumps; and a system for locating free-moving parts and monitoring their motion.

The problem lies in the supply of these systems. According to the system used for foreign trade operations, Energoimpeks should be the supplier. This organization is supposed to collect offers from producers and submit the most advantageous one to the Committee for Power Supply. Unfortunately, the committee's former chairman, Prof. Lyudmil Genov, instructed Energoimpeks to sign a contract to import the equipment from Siemens, and even the prices were fixed without consulting the specialists of the importing organization. (According to the source of the information, one of the systems costs over $1 million.)

At the same time, world concerns like Westinghouse and ABB offer these systems in a combined form instead of as separate systems, and at a price about 50-percent lower. The two companies' offers have not even been examined.

In the present situation, where the nation has no money in its pocket (I refer to the treasury's lack of convertible foreign exchange), I ask what motives prompted Prof. Lyudmil Genov to prefer Siemens? Actually, the answer to this question must be supplied by the Committee for Power Supply under the Council of Ministers.

Havel Reports on Progress of Constitution Talks

LD1810003291 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Czech 1853 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Interview with President Vaclav Havel by unidentified correspondent on constitutional talks in Karlovy Vary on 17 October—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Mr. President, this is the eleventh time that you have met in this highly representative combination with other constitutional officials. The meetings held up to now appeared very optimistic on the first day, but their optimism gradually disappeared somewhat. Do you think that matters will be clearer now regarding the constitutional setup?

[Havel] I must not run ahead of events, because the meeting has not yet ended. There is only a break in the proceedings. I can only talk about what we have discussed at this morning's session. Of course, as planned, we talked about the constitutional setup and our state's future. Therefore, the meeting is the continuation of the long series of discussions that you mentioned, with the greater part of the discussion focusing on what is a common state and what is a federation; what characterizes a common state, what attributes it must have to remain a state, and what powers, including economic powers, it must possess. This is why deputy prime ministers in charge of economic policies are here.

The debate was calm and businesslike. We went from one point to another, and those present clarified their views and, in many respects, these views were identical, although not all of them. Apart from that, another matter was discussed: the procedure to be adopted, which continues to present problems in one way or another and remains unclear, remains confused, and, in turn, creates a climate of nervousness. I myself have appealed to the constitutional officials present to try, within the framework of their possibilities and powers, to observe a certain timetable that would make sense. We face three possibilities: preserve a common state in some form, perhaps in a reconstructed form, or split in a constitutional, civilized, and cultural way into two states. This is the second alternative. As it is now, I prefer the first alternative. The third alternative, which is by far the worst, is that we be nothing, that we not be either two states or a single state, that a state of legal chaos will prevail, a total disintegration of powers. This is a state in which the Federal Assembly would be paralyzed and where constitutional reasons would exist for its dissolution. At the same time, this would halt the entire legislative process.

The president is not equipped with any powers to be able to save anything during that time. He would have to wait for a new election. The election would be for nothing. It would be a total waste. For what assembly would people be voting? They would perhaps be voting for the Czech and Slovak National Councils, but hardly to the Federal Assembly, which would be boycotted since I cannot imagine otherwise, given its structure today and the problem of the existence of the common state. My concern is to eliminate this third alternative, the alternative of chaos, dual law, and confusion. Therefore, I have recommended a sequence of steps. The presidia of both National Councils should begin discussions on the treaty between the two republics. They see it as an internal, state, legal document that would create a project of a common state. The presidia would then submit this project to the committees of both National Councils and, subsequently, to their plenum for a broad debate.

The 18th session of the Federal Assembly will begin on 29 October. It is uncertain whether it will pass a resolution on the referendum. Naturally, I would be glad if it did. The relevent procedural bill will apparently come. It would also have to adopt a bill on the division of assets, should the state be split up and, above all and chiefly, a draft of the referendum question. It would appear that it would be a very good thing if the referendum was held in December. Should the National Councils in the meantime finalize and approve the treaty, the referendum could then be withdrawn and would not have to take place; or it could have the character of a ratification, a confirmation of the treaty, should its outcome be in favor of a common state; or should the National Councils fail to reach an agreement about the treaty by December, then the referendum, should its outcome be in favor of a common state, would be a clear appeal, a clear directive, and a clear instruction by citizens to the National Councils to draw up the treaty quickly.

As soon as the treaty is completed, nothing stands in the way of drafting and adopting all three constitutions, and this process could be completed by the time the election is held, as we promised our voters. It is unclear in what sequence the constitutions would be approved: The republican ones would probably be first, followed by the Federal one. Of course, the condition would then be that all three legislatures, in adopting all these three constitutions, would take due regard of the treaty as the starting point and the source of the legitimacy of these constitutions. I regard as infeasible that a so-called pure constitution would be adopted by any of the two Republics, which means a constitution of an independent state, because this would be one of the roads that lead precisely to the state of chaos, dual law, confusion.

In case the treaty is adopted, there is no problem of adopting a constitution into which the treaty would be incorporated or the constitution would reckon with it, or the treaty could be an appendix to the constitution. This is not a big problem. However, the treaty should be the key to all three constitutions. This is my own notion, and we have also discussed it. Nonetheless, the main subject of today's discussions was specific powers and their division between the Republics and the Federation.

[Correspondent] How did your partners react to your proposals? You mentioned that the views differed considerably. How were they different? How were they identical?

[Havel] We will talk in greater detail about the order of these steps in the afternoon. We agreed that we would devote the morning session fully to the powers question. Nevertheless, apart from the fact that Slovak politicians have, as we know, a very reserved relationship toward the referendum, apart from this, I did not register any vehement resistance. The Slovak political representation allows for the fact that the agreement would precede republican constitutions, as well as the Federal Constitution. It is not that representatives of the political parties would be jointly determined at all costs to adopt some kind of a constitution of the Slovak Republic, regardless of the work on the agreement prior to the agreement and so on.

[Correspondent] I do not think that a referendum would have any great sense if citizens did not have at their disposal an exact economic analysis of variants in favor of which they are to decide. Did you also talk about this question?

[Havel] We talked about this in great detail. We will continue talking about it. Naturally, it is difficult to decide in a referendum whether there should be a united post office or two republican post offices or any special questions like this. Nevertheless, the referendum can provide an answer to the question that is comprehensible to all citizens—that is, whether they want to live in a common state. The basic attributes of the joint state can be directly characterized in two sentences in the question posed to the citizens so that everyone understands them.

[Correspondent] The screening bill has evoked a very controversial reaction. You submitted today to Assembly Chairman Alexander Dubcek your draft amendment to this bill. Can you tell us why you decided to enter a certain kind of conflict with the Federal Assembly?

[Havel] I handed a letter to Federal Assembly Chairman Dubcek. I handed it to the communication media, as well. I hope that it will be published in some newspapers tomorrow. In this letter—I will attempt briefly to recapitulate its contents—I say in this letter that, first, together with the majority of deputies, the majority of political parties, and the large part of our public, I am convinced of the need for this bill. It is transpiring that many people tied in with the totalitarian regime, who participated in infringing upon human rights, did not use the opportunity that occurred after our democratic revolution. They did not leave their posts, did not reflect their share of responsibility. These people continue to be there. This is upsetting the public because they adhere to the old practices. They behave in the same arrogant way. Some even have evil intentions. This does not evoke any trust in the democratic institutions of the state. It is an exceptional, unusual bill—I would say revolutionary—but, unfortunately, necessary. That is one thing.

The second thing is that, in my opinion, the bill is controversial in some of its elements. This is why I wrote Dubcek. I explained why I consider it problematic in this sense, and at the same time, I proposed principles of certain changes. The letter has the nature of a legislative initiative. However, it does not contain the paragraph text of a possible amendment. It represents an appeal to constitutional legal committees, as well as the legislative council of the Federal Government, to think about the principles proposed by me and to try to work out a draft amendment to this bill.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, which paragraphs are to be affected by your amendment? What amendments do you propose?

[Havel] I presume that the state naturally has the right to state the conditions for carrying out offices in the state administration or in the state apparatus. Nevertheless, the spirit of that law contains in itself an element that does not belong to the normal democratic legal code—that is, an element of collective guilt, of collective responsibility, in which belonging to a certain group that is determined only by external features is the last and the definitive yardstick for qualification of a citizen. Furthermore, a democratic state takes as a key yardstick for assessing people the internal material of the secret police. It also lacks what decent legal codes usually have—that is, the right to assess a case individually. If we had a constitutional court in our country, the question is whether it would not come to the conclusion that this law contradicts the adopted document of fundamental rights and freedoms. It is also a question of what would be a conclusion of various international institutions with regard to the contradiction of this law with various international conventions that we adopted.

I do not want to make anything more complicated; I do not want to enter into internal arguments of the Federal Assembly; I do not want to side with this or that political party. I am interested in one thing only: finding a way to remove the shortcomings of the law in the shortest possible time and in the simplest way, to do away with the causes of these objections, and to discover how not to delay the application of the law and, on the contrary, to speed up, not thwart, the purpose of this law.

The two main principles that I propose and have worked out specifically are:

First, utter confidentiality of testimonies. I propose to abolish the division into testimonies and findings. Those commissions and everything around them are far too complicated, and the way of finding out, ordering, and sending to institutions is unnecessarily complicated. In principle, every citizen has the right to ask to be screened, and the Ministry has the duty to hand over to him personally this testimony within two months, whatever it contains, and nobody but the person concerned ought to know about it. The person concerned will decide what to do once he has read the material.

In certain offices that are listed by the law, I propose that it be enforced that within six months from the moment the law will come into force, those people who are unable to provide a testimony within the six months, which

would make them qualified to carry out these offices, would be asked to leave their jobs. This means that everybody would have six months to think over what to do. He might be able to leave his office without anybody taking any notice or anybody knowing what his reasons are for leaving. He would have this chance. After six months he would have to put forward testimony. This is one principle in which there will be complete confidentiality combined with the duty to have the testimony for certain offices.

The second principle I propose is the possibility of an appeal to a normal court. I propose that special senates be set up at regional and supreme courts, where those people who are convinced that the testimony does not do them justice, that it does not take into consideration the special circumstances in which they made a pledge to this or that type of cooperation with the secret police—I mention a number of typical examples—who are convinced that injustice is done to them, that not all specific aspects of their particular case are considered—that, for example, it is not taken into consideration that somebody signed something when he was 20 and had doubts about what he was signing, and then for 30 years he fought for human rights and democracy and so on—that is, the people who would want to defend themselves, will be given this possibility by the special senate. I think there will be not too many of them because, at that moment, the confidentiality is over and every statement will become public. It means starting a public court case, and those courts will have a right to assess the case and eventually to pass a sentence that this person, despite such and such testimony, is qualified to carry out this or that office.

The same thing would apply if somebody brings a statement of honor that he was a member of the peoples' militia or something similar, in which he will admit that he does not adhere to one or the other condition but, at the same time, he thinks that he was forced to join or that it all happened under special circumstances and, in this way, he admits that it did happen but, at the same time, he would appeal to the court to decide in his favor. This would be possible as well. This would be the basic principle of a democratic legal code—that is, that the different cases would be assessed on an individual basis.

I do not want to make more complicated the list of offices to which it applies or the list of categories of people who do not meet those conditions, although I mention the possibilities where it could be improved or amended. This is not the main topic of my suggestions, but the actual method of carrying it out or the application of the law.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, thank you for the interview.

Slovak Hungarian Leaders View Minorities Issues

AU1610171191 Prague RESPEKT in Czech No. 41, 14-20 Oct 91 pp 7-8

[Istvan Leko article: "Every Knife Would Flick Open"—including an interview with Egyutteles-Coexistence Movement Chairman Miklos Duray by unidentified RESPEKT correspondent; place and date not given]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted]

Disputes and Differences

Three Hungarian political groupings were established in Slovakia following the events of November 1989—the Hungarian Christian Democratic Movement (MKDH), the liberal Hungarian Independent Initiative (MNI), and the Egyutteles-Coexistence Movement. These three smaller parties recently formed a roundtable to seek cooperation models on minority policy issues.

Karoly Toth, the 32-year-old MNI general secretary, graduated from Comenius University Philosophical Faculty. He was director of the Bratislava MADACH publishing house until November 1989. In connection with the MNI's point of view, he says: "I can sum it up in five points. Our party is unequivocally in favor of a federation, and we support the idea of a referendum as a constitutional means of resolving the constitutional and legal issue. We support the adoption of the screening law and the screening of Slovak National Council deputies and Slovak Government members. The fifth point concerns cooperation among the Hungarian parties in Slovakia. Unfortunately, it is apparent from our negotiations that there are very serious—sometimes diametric—differences among us, especially between the MNI and Egyutteles."

Why? Why is it said in the Federal Assembly lobbies that the Hungarian parties hate each other more than the extreme right wing and the communists? The Hungarian press published in Slovakia has also split. Some newspapers harangue Egyutteles for not wanting a federation and say that its leaders linked up with Meciar because they support an independent Slovakia. We often read in newspapers inclined toward the Egyutteles Movement that the MNI no longer defends the rights of minorities because it has remained in the government that proposed the language law.

The reason for the mutual spite is, obviously, the fact that the individual parties view issues from completely different perspectives. Egyutteles considers all political events in Czechoslovakia from one angle: How much will they contribute or not contribute toward the ethnic minorities' situation.

"For example, in the issue of 'a federation or a Slovak state,' the most important thing for Egyutteles is which entity will grant it greater rights," explains Karoly Toth. "As far as the MNI is concerned, this is baleful logic. Our opinion has not changed. We look at the issue from the point of view of constitutionality and the law-governed

state. The political force established recently under the name 'Committee for a Sovereign Slovakia' has political entities among its ranks—first and foremost, I mean parties and personalities—that will in no way guarantee a law-governed state. According to Egyutteles, Hungarians living in Slovakia must not intervene in a Czech-Slovak dispute because they would only pay for it every time. Apparently, if they were to support the Czech point of view, this would not be tactful because no one yet knows who the victor will be. This is a pragmatic stance, but, despite this, I cannot agree with it. I do not support any 'Czech' point of view, but a specific constitutional and legal arrangement. The fact that I am in favor of constitutionality does not mean that I would like to deprive Slovaks of any rights."

The Yugoslav Variant

A declaration of Slovak sovereignty would mean the establishment of a Slovak state on CSFR territory, but Czechoslovakia would not automatically collapse. A consequence of this would be that a dual legal code, at least, or utter anarchy would prevail in Slovakia. According to the MNI secretary, this scenario brings the threat of civil war. "Some parties would observe the federation's legal code, while others would observe the sovereign Slovak legal code. This is virtually the same as the Yugoslav situation or the situation in the Baltic states a year ago. Union commandos will calmly occupy radio and television buildings; however, in accordance with their own laws, the nationalist forces can start a battle against the commandos because they will also be able to refer to the law. Such legal duality gives rise to terrible situations. It is absolutely clear that in a legally uncertain situation the minority nation suffers more than the majority nation. Under such circumstances, minorities even lose the rights guaranteed to them beforehand."

Articles have been appearing in the Slovak press about Hungarian separatists, chauvinists, and the "Magyarization" of Slovaks living in South Slovakia. There is little objective information; it is possible to say that the average Slovak knows as much about his Hungarian fellow citizens as the average Hungarian knows about Slovaks. At the same time, nothing contributes more to outbursts of hatred and prejudice than a lack of information. If the situation develops along the lines suggested by the leading articles in the nationalist press, it could happen that the Hungarian minority will lose patience and will radicalize its political stances. Then, perhaps, demands will really be made for territorial or cultural autonomy, demands that—at the moment—patriots merely use as a bogey man.

"I think it is possible that, during the course of political negotiations, this solution could crop up. I do not know how the other Hungarian representatives will vote on the sovereignty issue. However, I certainly do know that we will be against it," says Karoly Toth. "A certain rashness is palpable within the Public Against Violence [VPN] Movement; this stems from its internal inconsistency. Admittedly, there has been no serious split, but it is making more and more mistakes. For example, Miklosko's pronouncement in connection with the German-Czechoslovak treaty is a typical example of a step that had not been well thought out. It all results from the fact that Czechoslovakia's continuity has existed since 1918, because if it had not existed, every issue would crack open and every knife would flick open."

Miklos Duray is a Federal Assembly deputy and chairman of Egyutteles. [passage omitted]

Without Illusions

[RESPEKT] What is the current situation of Slovak Hungarians?

[Duray] This will obviously sound pessimistic, but, in comparison with the communist era, the minorities' legal position is worse. The problem does not lie in the sphere of universal human rights, but in the sphere of specific rights. One example will suffice: The Document on Rights and Freedoms qualifies minority rights on a lower level than the 1968 constitutional law. The majority of principles approved by the Helsinki process are not reflected in the document, while the principles adopted by the Copenhagen conference on the human dimension and the Council of Europe's recommendations from last October are missing from it. This is a general example. A specific example is the fact that the language law discriminates against minorities in the use of their mother tongue; it virtually makes natural bilingualism impossible. This was made possible by public agreement before the language law; now it is impossible.

[RESPEKT] How does the Hungarian minority react to nationalist attacks in the press and on the streets? What is the outlook for the future?

[Duray] I have no illusions about the status of ethnic minorities within the federation, and even fewer within the framework of an independent Slovakia. Everyone must realize that if an independent Slovak state is established, we will be in a much worse position at the beginning than we are in now. I am talking about the initial stages, because it is impossible to judge at the moment how political life would develop. However, judging by the kind of political parties that are the driving force behind Slovak statehood today, it is possible to deduce that nothing good is in store for the minorities. Therefore, I consider it natural that every member of an ethnic minority wants to preserve the joint state. This is the case.

[RESPEKT] Why, then, did Egyutteles not participate in the pro-federal demonstration on Vajansky Embankment?

[Duray] In accordance with our party's program, we must coexist with everyone who lives on our common territory. This is the first reason. I do not agree that political parties that pursue different aims turn to us when they need support. When we want to implement

our rights, as a rule, we are rejected by these parties. I mean the VPN, the Democratic Party, and the majority of Czech political parties. This is to say nothing of the fact that two people with whom we cannot appear on the same platform spoke to the demonstrators on Vajansky Embankment. For example, the Democratic Party's honorary chairman, Mr. Kvetko, criticized Husak's ethnic policy while in exile and said that it was too favorable toward the ethnic minorities.

Moral Rehabilitation Has Not Come

[RESPEKT] You say you have no illusions about the federation. Why?

[Duray] It is not apparent from federal law how seriously the federal government takes the issue of looking after the ethnic minorities. On the other hand, we had one specific meeting with Civic Movement representatives in Bratislava in which we asked Pavel Rychetsky what, in his opinion, the federal state can do for the ethnic minorities. His reply was unequivocal: Apparently, at the current time and under current conditions, he is unable to imagine that the Federal Government could do more. This, of course, will not satisfy the ethnic minorities—on the contrary. Moreover, there is the law on rehabilitation and the law on land. Both laws have, in fact, confirmed the loss of the ethnic minorities' rights in the years 1945-1948. This mainly involved the Hungarian and German minorities and, partially the Polish and Jewish minorities, if their members acknowledged Hungarian or German nationality. The limit set by these laws for any kind of compensation is 25 February 1948. However, there are several hundred thousand people in Czechoslovakia who were more affected in the years 1945 to 1948. These people desire rehabilitation, not so much material rehabilitation, but rather moral rehabilitation. I am extremely disappointed by the fact that this has still not happened.

The Democratic Character of Revolutions Is Disappearing

The Egyutteles [movement] issued several statements, from which it is obvious that the movement demands the existence of a common Czechoslovak state. Nevertheless, its stance includes the stipulation that the right to sovereignty cannot be removed from the federal framework.

I consider it inappropriate that the Slovaks who long for independence are pressed to give up their wish. That is against basic human rights. We believe that it is possible to maintain the federation and, at the same time, to devise an internal independence to aid the political development of the Slovak people.

Now, after the single-party system has gone, Eastern Europe has arrived at the point at which it was in 1918—or perhaps, rather, the point at which, for various reasons, the 18th-century process of national revolutions stopped. In our region, however, this process has never been concluded. The 20th-century national self-determination was under foreign influence and, in the communist era, it ceased completely. After the overthrow of the Bolshevik regimes, these endeavors regained prominence. I believe that in the case of Slovakia, this process cannot be stopped. If the majority of Slovak political forces wants an independent Slovakia, it would not be right to try to prevent it. The burden of responsibility for the process of becoming independent would take lies on the liberal forces. As they have not taken their place at the head of the nationalist endeavors, they left plenty of room for various extremist forces. This is why, in this region, the democratic character of national revolutions is gradually disappearing.

A Source of More Tension

Is it possible that the Hungarian minority would demand a declaration of autonomy within the Slovak state?

The Egyutteles talked about it with Jan Carnogursky and Vladimir Meciar. We asked about their idea of a method for dealing with the national issue. Prime Minister Carnogursky categorically refused autonomy, both cultural and territorial. He justified his position by arguing that such a step would automatically mean a possibility of a border revision for Hungary. I disagree. I believe that a denial of the minority rights to a self-administration will be a source of more tension.

Vladimir Meciar has not answered our question at all, or rather, his answer revealed that he does not have any ideas regarding the method. He invited us to meet with him again, and we accepted. The meeting was useful for me, because it demonstrated that I have not been wrong in assessing Mr. Meciar in the past. Namely, on 27 September 1990, I was the first person to question Meciar's political credibility. At the time, I was attacked from all sides—but half a year later, they admitted I was right.

Defense Secretary Views Army's Capabilities

AU1510105591 Budapest MAGYARORSZAG in Hungarian 9 Oct 91 pp 1,3

[Interview with Erno Raffay, political state secretary at the Ministry of Defense, by Zsolt Nemeth; place and date not given: "Erno Raffay: We Are Able To Defend Ourselves"]

[Text] The escalation of the Yugoslav civil war confronts Hungary with a new situation on a daily basis and forces the government to take stances. We asked Erno Raffay about the most recent developments affecting his ministry.

[Nemeth] German Christian Democratic Party members suggested that Hungary should be given military assistance because it would not be able to ward off a possible Yugoslav aggression....

[Raffay] Undoubtedly, it is a fact that our Army's technical equipment is not satisfactory and our present arsenal is outdated. I still dare say that we are able to ward off a possible military aggression. I can support my statement with two factors. On the one hand, the aggressor has to have a multiple superiority to start a war in the hope of victory. However, there is not such a large disproportion between the two armies. At the same time, we have information on frequent disobedience of orders in the Yugoslav Federal Army and that they are struggling with morale problems. In contrast, our Army is well-disciplined and it is ready to defend our borders.

[Nemeth] The German party politicians also urge that the modernization of the Hungarian Army's arsenal would be beneficial. They have suggested to the government in Bonn that it render assistance to Hungary in this matter....

[Raffay] I see this as another sign of the political, economic, and military trust that the West shows toward Hungary. This is no accident because Hungary is considered as the most solid point among the countries of our area. The modernization of our Army's technical equipment is also a very timely task.

[Nemeth] According to the news, it has been suggested as an alternative that the Federal Army soldiers stationed in Slovenia would leave the newly independent republic via Hungary. Can you confirm this information?

[Raffay] Our ministry has not yet been officially informed about this and we do not consider the exploratory questions of Serbian military circles as official information. If they seriously raise this issue then we will have to answer according to the provisions of our current Constitution. According to that, foreign troops are not allowed to be stationed in Hungary, especially the troops of a warring party. At the same time, we are not insensitive to the question of where these units will be deployed next, either.

Interior Ministry on Border Traffic Restrictions

AU1810084891 Budapest MTI in English 1434 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Budapest 16 Oct (MTI)—"The October 4 measure of the Hungarian Government to tighten rules for the entry of foreigners to the country met with the approval of most European governments, notwithstanding counter-measures by a few East European countries", journalists were told at the Ministry of the Interior in Budapest on Wednesday. Brigadier-General Gyorgy Balogh, national commander of the Customs and Excise Office, said that, after initial disorders, border traffic was by now back to normal.

Over the first ten days, close to 104,000 people from 34 countries were turned back from the border for failing to meet the new regulations. The decreasing number of such cases indicates recognition of the country's intention to keep away people posing a danger to law and order, and public security. One in five foreigners came from Eastern Europe, 90 per cent of whom were sent back because of lack of sufficient money.

With regard to the counter-measures, journalists were told that about 15 per cent of Hungarian travellers were denied entry to Romania on similar grounds.

Yugoslav Defectors Interviewed on Army Practices

AU1710144891 Budapest 168 ORA in Hungarian 8 Oct 91 p 19

[Interview with unnamed Yugoslav defectors and Judit Toth, deputy chairwoman of the Hungarian Refugee Affairs Office, by Gabriella Lantos and Katalin Sandor; place and date not given: "I Will Not Go to the Slaughterhouse"]

[Text] The following interview was conducted with defecting soldiers who have fled from Yugoslavia to Hungary. Understandably, we will not give you their names, nor will we make a distinction between different speakers. We also interviewed Judit Toth.

[168 ORA] When did you first feel that you were not in the least bit safe at home?

[Yugoslav soldier] I found out that a lot of young men had been drafted on Sunday. On Monday morning, I could no longer sit still. The only thing I could think about was that they would come and get me now, that I was the next in line. The messenger is accompanied by a police escort in some places.

There have been examples of people being dragged off with handcuffs if they did not want to go. If someone tried to escape, they captured him and beat him. They have even drafted 48- or 50-year-olds.

When these older men were soldiers, they used weapons that are so old, they do not even exist anymore. They told us that they were not even given weapons to defend themselves

with. In other cases, they were given weapons with the wrong bullets, so their weapons failed to fire.

Evacuated Vojvodina

[168 ORA] Did you contact the Refugee Affairs Office when you arrived in Hungary?

[Yugoslav soldier] No, because there is a rumor here that those who register with the office, in other words, those who apply for political asylum in Hungary cannot return to Yugoslavia for a few years.

[168 ORA] You lived with your family. Did you bring your wife and child with you to Hungary?

[Yugoslav soldier] I received my call-up draft on Tuesday. I do not want to go to the slaughterhouse, and who knows what they will do to my wife. The whole affair might have consequences. Perhaps this is the safest solution.

[168 ORA] Why is it that youths from Vojvodina who are fleeing from their call-up drafts are allowed to cross the Yugoslav border without any complications?

[Yugoslav soldier] If Vojvodina can be evacuated, let the people who live there go wherever they like. Serbs will arrive from Croatia and Bosnia, and they will need housing and jobs. These people are all arriving from down south, and they are starting to introduce their laws here.

[168 ORA] Have you met anyone who has returned from the war? Have you spoken to any of these people?

[Yugoslav soldier] My Serbian colleague told me that in Vukovar—the place they were taken to—90 percent of the soldiers were ethnic Hungarians. Only the active officers were Serbs. The mind boggles when you hear about the orders they give. For example, they said: We are going to clean up Vukovar. It has been liberated. Shoot anything that moves—women and children alike.

[168 ORA] Are you not afraid of possible reprisals?

[Yugoslav soldier] Reprisals are a possibility. Many people have come across to Hungary—those who do not want to fight in the war or do not want to shoot. It is a good thing if half of them return. We hope they will not take reprisals against us for fleeing. We have heard that an increasing number of Serbs are refusing to do their military service.

The government in Belgrade needs an outside enemy so that it can unite Serbs again. They are also talking about the Albanians, saying that they are going to attack Yugoslavia.

[168 ORA] Have you met any reservists who have returned from the war?

[Yugoslav soldier] They are merciless with the reservists. They place them at the front, on the fighting line. And the army, in collaboration with the Chetniks, is behind their back, so they are caught between two fires.

[168 ORA] There are going to be local elections over there soon....

[Yugoslav soldier] I think back of the last election results and I notice that the number of call-ups has increased in the areas where few people voted for Milosevic's party. We are afraid of provocation, we are afraid of the collection of data. People feel defenseless if their names and addresses are stored somewhere in an official place.

Refugees' "Open Card"

[168 ORA] As far as I know, the Geneva Convention does not apply to the people who have come over here from Yugoslavia as a result of the civil war because they are applying for temporary asylum. On what basis do you accept these people into Hungary?

[Judit Toth] Most of the people who have arrived here have still not asked for asylum. In such cases, Hungary tries to comply with the circumstances laid down in the general norms of international human rights, because there is a civil war going on in Yugoslavia.

[168 ORA] Would the situation change if Croatia were recognized?

[Toth] If this conflict affected the civilian population of two independent countries, then the so-called humanitarian legal agreement that was signed in 1949 would play a much more determining role. Indeed, this agreement defines the exact type of protection to be offered to the civilian population.

[168 ORA] It is rather a delicate situation because it is not only civilians who are fleeing, but also youths who want to avoid a call-up. Are they judged in a different way?

[Toth] It is neither an advantage nor a disadvantage if people have refused to do their military service or if they have participated in a military exercise (for example) and thus ended up in Hungary. If no proceedings have been initiated against these people—and I believe that this is the case for most of them—then we can formally treat them as if they had arrived here with some kind of document.

[168 ORA] After 30 days, they will no longer be allowed to stay without a visa. What will happen to them then?

[Toth] Nobody is automatically recognized as a refugee. In order to be recognized, the individual must at least initiate proceedings. If people do not initiate proceedings, the alien police will check up on them sooner or later. Then they will have great difficulties in explaining to the police officer why they did not contact the Hungarian authorities until then. This also diminishes these people's chances of receiving refugee status. Indeed, according to Hungarian law, people have to report within 72 hours of having crossed the Hungarian border. I can only advise everybody to put their cards on the table and to try and establish relations with the Hungarian authorities in accordance with their individual interests and possibilities.

Financier Analyzes State Finance Reform

AU1610170591 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 14 Oct 91 p 7

[Interview with Laszlo Lengyel, director of the Finance Research Ltd., by Peter Lovasz; place and date not given: "Mihaly Kupa's Dilemmas, as Laszlo Lengyel Sees Them—We Keep Patching Up the Old"]

[Text] According to all indications, despite the government's election promises, the state's role in the economy will not be decreased substantially. Therefore, next year's prospects will be largely determined by the stability of the central budget. We asked Laszlo Lengyel whether it is at all possible to come up with an at least acceptable budget in Hungary's current economic and political situation.

[Lengyel] The guidelines clearly show that our 1992 budget is being prepared in the traditional way, which means that for the time being state finances will not be reformed. At the moment, we have a tax system that lays down the types, although not the sizes, of taxes in a law. All taxpayers are mostly aware of how much money they have to pay to the treasury and according to which rules. On the other hand, there are no rules on the expenditure, and our parliament approves an expenditure each year. In a peculiar way, it was Mihaly Kupa himself who, at the moment of introducing the tax system—the first element of the budget reform in 1987—said that this practice would not be good. If the revenue is precisely regulated then the expenditure side also has to be regulated, otherwise the budget is bound to be tight and unstable each year. This prediction has completely been proved so far.

[Lovasz] Financial circles maintain that the reform of state finances cannot be implemented until everyone agrees on which tasks are to be wholly or partially financed by the state. To achieve this, it is necessary to work out the operational concepts and the expenditure norms for the various public services and organizations. That might take years. Do you accept this view?

[Lengyel] Not in this form. It is probably possible and necessary to argue with many elements of the Kupa program, but the fact that the program is uniform and determines the tasks in a system that points at the interconnecting factors is a great merit. This attitude will also have to prevail in state finance reform. It is an impossible view that "I will reform education today, health next year, defense and the police a bit later." Especially as far as expenses are concerned, these factors are interdependent, and they jointly form the expenses of the state budget.

It is impossible to make a separate law on every item of public spending because that would result in a "begging competition" rather than in state finance reform. Everyone would want to get more money for himself from the public purse, and they would present believable and well-founded reasons. This would result in the same situation we have now, namely that people bargain for the public funds and the politically weaker ministries become losers.

[Lovasz] Do you think that the political considerations of influential groups prevent the implementation of the finance minister's plans?

[Lengyel] I do not think that this is likely, but I cannot exclude the possibility, either. In my view, already at the time the Kupa program was published, it met certain given factors that the minister has not been able to cope with to this very day. I am talking about the compensation, the law on church properties, but other rules that served the formation of a market economy had also been functioning in our economy by then, like the laws on enterprises, restructuring, and so on. The logical order has been overturned, and we are in a considerable delay. For example, we have a concession law, but do not yet have a law on government property, therefore, we do not know what can be given into concession. At the same time, our legislation is also occupied with other matters. This way, it is impossible to see how a unified system will be created by a consistent legislation. We are practically patching up our old economic system while time passes, and everything is actually falling apart.

[Lovasz] Do you think it is possible that the parliament will reject the budget plan under these circumstances?

[Lengyel] I think this is impossible. Naturally, the parliament will "tear the draft budget to pieces," and there will be hundreds of suggestions. However, party discipline will probably come into force, and the authority of the leadership will prevail in a strained situation—especially because the deputies are not really in a position to make a decision. Even if they go over everything very carefully, they can only achieve changes affecting 10 percent (or, much rather, only 5 percent) of income and expenditure. If a higher proportion of the draft budget was changed then—to put it this way—the whole feeble "edifice" would collapse because of its interconnections. It is true that no one will know the reasons for the given expenditure proportions but the parliament will be unable to change these proportions substantially, all the more so, because the IMF would not be very happy, either, if we started 1992 without an approved budget. It is obviously more important to keep our external sources of finance than to worry about the fate of 1 or 2 billion forints in our budget.

Of course, the situation would be different if the opposition submitted a well-founded and better version of the budget, namely some kind of a counterbudget, to parliament. However, to my knowledge, none of the opposition parties have such a plan. Thus, I believe that everything will remain the same and the 1992 budget will be not at all better than the 1991 budget, no matter what the finance minister promised in December 1990.

Walesa Interviewed on National Issues

LD1710124191 Warsaw Radio Warszawa Network in Polish 0700 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Interview with President Lech Walesa by Radio Warszawa correspondents Andrzej Trojanowski and Andrzej Jelenski in the Belvedere Palace in Warsaw; from "An Hour With the President" program; correspondents are unidentifiable during interview—live]

[Text] [Announcer] It is 0800. Now "An Hour With the President." We are going live to the Belvedere, the office of the President of the Polish Republic. Andrzej Trojanowski from the Baltic studio in Gdansk and Andrzej Jelenski from Warsaw are welcoming the listeners from Belvedere.

[Walesa] The president of the Polish Republic also welcomes you. [Correspondent] We welcome President Walesa, who is the guest on our live program. The president will reply to questions from listeners in Warsaw and Gdansk. We have selected from a few thousand phone calls the most important and frequently asked questions by our listeners. And so we begin. The first question is from Wlodzimierz Wieruszewski in Szczecin who suggests that for the good of our fatherland, its authority in the world, and respect for the highest office in the state, Mr. Lech Walesa should not make public live appearances on radio and television. I think that the Belvedere knows the situation in Poland. Statements could be prepared in advance, and then the president could read them out without entering into any discussions or polemics.

[Correspondent] I have a different question: In the spring, you promised that you would, appearing on television, explain to your electorate certain of the most important problems. So far, there has been no such program with the president. Why, asks Piotr (?Wec) from Gdansk.

[Walesa] These two questions demonstrate the contradictions in tendencies and in understanding of the role of the president. [sentence as heard] I think that in this situation, because of their needs, I must answer to or meet with the people. One can have different views; however, today I am at your disposal.

[Correspondent] I have read with mixed feelings your appeal for questions from ordinary citizens to be sent, gathered, compiled, and conveyed to the competent ministries, asking them to respond publicly on special television programs. I am full of admiration for your idea, says Eugeniusz Rafal from Gliwice.

[Walesa] Yes, I can see what is happening in Poland, and I know how many misunderstandings there are. One must remember that we have dismantled a system and chased the old owner away. Everything must be put in order. Putting in order means, first and foremost, understanding. The president or government is blamed for everything today. One has to remember that in a democratic system the situation is slightly different. Let each person be responsible for his sector of work. Let each person try to consult and explain a decision or the lack of those decisions.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, a question from our own backyard. So much was spoken about access to radio and television, and yet the issue has been dragging on for so long. There are no appropriate laws, and the president is actually speaking to a bankrupt Polish radio and television, says a listener in Elblag.

[Walesa] I think one should speak about all of this in broader terms. Krakow was not, after all, built in one day. After all, 50 years of the communist system paved their own way, cooperation, and action of different kinds. Today, all this has to be fit into a different system, into a different manner; and this is not very easy. On the other hand, one can think and say that someone could do this better, do it in a different manner. This is a great, huge task that, according to some is proceeding slowly; according to others, it is proceeding well.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, you are being blamed for every evil that is taking place on the threshold of the construction of a democratic Poland. Why can you not rectify the situation in Poland, what makes it difficult to act in the presidential office, who rules in Poland, what can you do, and what can you not do, Mr. President?

[Correspondent] I have a question from listeners on the coast. Who rules in Poland, Mr. President? Is it the president, the Parliament, the government, the church, or maybe some other institution? Well, really, what power does Lech Walesa have in the Polish Republic?

[Walesa] I realized this when I ran for this office. I knew that the problems were very difficult, that it would be very difficult to put all the issues in a new way. And today I have a grievance for the theorists, for the people who have propaganda resources: There are too few explanations as to how our system should be and on what it depends.

Of course, the easiest thing to do is to say: You wanted to be president and now you should deliver. What we are building, one might say, should look more or less like this: The first and most important power is the power that regulates the law, introduces rules and laws; namely, the Parliament itself. There is an executive power that implements those laws, and there is a third sector that is necessary; namely, the legislature, judiciary. At the moment, we have a president and government, one might say, from the new era. However, the two remaining parts are still stuck in the old arrangement. We still have the Parliament, which has to be changed from top to bottom, so that it is in line with democracy. This will take place in a few hours. [sentence as heard]

Later, this will all have to be fine-tuned and regulated. For today, we have, as I say, a rudimentary system that

impedes action, that does not allow for action even in the majesty of law, the law that we inherited from the previous system.

[Correspondent] What power does Lech Walesa have in the Polish Republic after all?

[Walesa] For today, as it were, there is no power; it may be described in a few words. On the other hand, I say, one cannot build something new on the basis of old laws. Of course, I could be tempted to act in a dictatorial manner of some sort, I could disregard laws, the Constitution, and the Parliament. I could do all of this. However, what we are doing, what we are building must be based on pluralism and the law. It must also be based on the manner in which we are settling matters; that is, in the most legal manner. We could do this already today, because already today we could have the influence. However, as I say, one has to put everything in order wisely.

[Correspondent] However, despite all of this, the listeners are wondering why Lech Walesa, the president of the Polish Republic, realizing completely the situation with the Sejm, has not dissolved this Parliament. Did he not have enough power or, being directed by democratic ideas, did he not allow this to be done?

[Walesa] Of course, I could have acted differently. On the other hand, the direction in which we are going, based on democracy, must not allow, even the president who has been elected by the people, to break any laws. The law may be bad, it may make our lives difficult and cause various scandals, but action in relation to this law must be legal. In connection with this, I tried, on the verge of anarchy and irrationality, to bring about a situation in which all of this would sort itself out logically. All of this was at a cost, but nothing is free in this world, and we are paying for this revolution. Someone may say that the price is too high perhaps. Perhaps.

[Correspondent] A question from Antoni Pietkiewicz in Gdansk: I was encouraged to make this phone call by the following three cliches that recur in the president's statements, along the lines of: We overthrew the communist system; take matters into your own hands; and things are normal. Second, I was encouraged by the lies in the mass media, where television is in the ignoble lead; and third, by the relays from the Sejm, which remind me of the open air markets in Poland or in Asia rather than a European parliament.

[Walesa] Ladies and gentlemen, in the electoral campaign I promised a lot; I want and must realize this. It is necessary, however, to have resources and legal means, parliamentary means, for this to be possible. I will strive to realize everything I promised, but I am not able, because a competent system has not yet been built to achieve all this. However, we are sorting matters out. The next big act of tidying up will accomplished by holding elections. We will sort out the political sector. No one will be able to say that they did not have an opportunity to participate in democratic pluralism or to make decisions. Only after that can other things be sorted out.

[Correspondent] During the presidential campaign, you promised a quick introduction of law and order in the streets and (?in homes). Has it, according to your opinion, been implemented, asks Edward (?Dubniewski) from Warsaw.

[Walesa] Yes and no. I immediately and urgently asked the appropriate ministers to supplement staff and others [as heard] so that my promise might be implemented. It seemed that everything had been going well, but again, ladies and gentlemen, let us not delude ourselves. The structure of the militia, now the police, has remained partially unchanged. After all, we did not have any program, we did not have specialists; we have obstacles made by a different sort of shady speculator, a different sort of people from the old order. Because of all this, our actions cannot become better and more effective in a single day, or the following day. One has to work out all this in new conditions, new principles. That is why I do not like it very much but, after all, the president alone and a handful of people who were prepared and fought well were not, and are not, prepared for work. Work is more difficult. It has to be learned. That is why time is needed so that all this can be put into order in a new way. I would also like everything to be done; I am dissatisfied too. I also know how this should be done, but I will not be able to do all this by myself only. I must achieve this in a legal manner. This means that the next sector must be won—this will lead us to normalcy. It is necessary to take part in the elections, because this is the only way matters can be arranged.

[Correspondent] You have spoken about old structures in the police force. Therefore, maybe I could quote a question from a listener from the tri-city, because the issue of those presidential campaign promises that concern public law and order appear very often in telephone questions. In the presidential campaign, Mr. Walesa promised he would give two months to all police commanders to establish order. If [words indistinct], then those commanders would be delivering letters. At present, postal services have not improved at all, and law and order in the streets is, as everybody knows, as it has been.

[Walesa] Let me put it this way. Of course, in times of the old order very many crimes were committed, but one did not speak about it; it was all hushed up. Today, when people have little to say on various economic and other subjects, they pull out little slogans, catchy images, things we did not speak about before. This does not mean I disregard the state of security. I did everything. I encouraged and supported people responsible for the order. Again, this is not very simple. It is necessary to prepare in advance. There must be not any accidents in this regard; there must be professionalism in performing this difficult function. Even though my recommendations have been fulfilled, this is not going smoothly because, as I keep saying, commissions and professionalism take time to build, and because it takes time,

things are not going well yet. However, I hope that again, in a truly free Poland, we will be able to work in all areas. At the moment, we are not working, but again, time is needed.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, a question concerning your electoral presidential campaign: Where is my 100 million zloty that you promised? [During his presidential campaign, Walesa promised that each Pole would have 100 million zloty worth of shares in the national assets.] If Minister Lewandowski is blocking it, why does the president not throw him out, asks a young man from Krakow.

[Walesa] Again the question is: Does Walesa have a dictatorship or a democracy? How nice it would be if the Parliament, the others, and the government supported my decision or my proposal for each poor Pole to have the opportunity to take Poland in his hands. I will return to the subject of the 100 million zloty because I think this is the only thing that will give Poland back to the Poles. The poor people should be given 100 million zloty or perhaps more, no, not given, lent without being charged interest and over a long period, so that Poland finds its way back to the Poles. At the moment, this has not been done and this is bad. If I were listened to then, if I were listened to in regard to the decrees [Walesa's desire to rule by decrees, bypassing the Parliament], today Poland would be a different place. However, some want to over-democratize Poland. They want to take away powers from the president and executive aparatus so that debates are prolonged, so that they can take advantage of bypassing the law, from stretching it and breaking it.

That is because by the time the law thinks up something clever, in fact, it is all over. So, I hope that I will be understood by society, which will participate in helping the President, because he wants to and must fulfill everything that he promised, because this was and is necessary for Poland today.

[Correspondent] By the way, since you mention it, regarding the law, Mr President, Mr. Czeslaw Grabowski from Warsaw asks when we will begin to punish thieves, swindlers and embezzlers in Poland? Another caller notes, Sir, that it seems your slogan 'take matters into your own hands' has been exploited, has been put into practice with the greatest speed by swindlers. The next question is from Mr. Gerard [name indistinct], regarding all the great financial scandals. Why does our President tolerate corruption; why does he not fight this? Can he not, or does he not want to? Andrzej Robel from Gdynia asks if our democracy is based on supporting thieves? There is talk of scandals all the time. What has happened to the President's promise to fight the swindlers?

[Walesa] Ladies and gentlemen, due to the political arrangement that came out of the Roundtable and later, it transpired that I could work more effectively when working behind the scenes because, under a different arrangement, I would have entered the structures that I would support or authorize. Therefore, I would have tried to work as hard as possible, but behind the scenes. I did the most work in the sphere of the legislature, the prosecutor's office, the police, and the Office of State Protection (UOP), where I encouraged and requested that Poland be told why this was happening, why we were not efficient, why there were such scandals, etc. But as I have said, this was not visible. After, say 10 attempts, I revealed one piece of work in the prosecutor's office. Again, all of this must be improved, but it cannot all be done in one day.

The President, even if he were a saint, would not be able to fulfill the role of the police or the prosecutor's office. He cannot alone manage all such matters. On the other hand, I insist, and will insist on this, I will not allow a single zloty that was taken from the Poles [as heard]. But in order for this to happen, we must have order in the legal system; the law will have to allow this, the law that we want to create must be created by us together. Otherwise, it would lead to dictatorship, to....[Walesa changes thought] Moreover, with people from the old system, would the police force, or whoever else, execute such an order even if I issued it? All this has to be done within the framework of the law, and you are creating the law by, first and foremost, your participation in the elections.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, the law is the law, but the average citizen is concerned with a basic question: how to live, or rather, how to survive? There were hundreds of phone calls from disabled and old-age pensioners.

[Walesa] Yes. And again, if it depended on me, if I had powers and resources, it would have been different in Poland a long time ago. Even the best President cannot settle all these matters himself. Everything must become part of a system, but again, it all costs. That is why our economic, political, and social restructuring is lingering on and requires greater social participation. One cannot say: We elected you, you agreed, and then now you deliver. If the situation is bad, if the situation is difficult, if one does not like something, then I ask that everything that is possible be taken into one's own hands. Today, it is possible to put the law in order and to give the government and the President power to implement them all. It is not possible to do many things today.

[Correspondent] But how are the disabled and old-age pensioners, or mothers bringing up children, to take matters into their own hands.

[Walesa] I agree that this cannot be done in a (?straightforward) manner. [words indistinct] what am I to do in my small village? Of course, if someone looks at such matters from above, one is powerless and helpless [as heard].

But this can be done by regulation and by normalizing the system. Normalcy in the system is built, as I said, in three areas: First, you have the President, and he will

serve you faithfully. Give him good deputies and the right to act, give powers to the government and to the President. The president may try to take them away by force. Is he able to do it? Possibly not. But the rest of the country must be sorted out in an organized way, not in the partisan way. This is the middle of Europe; there can be no wild west here.

We have moved considerably toward normalcy, but we have had many failures because we did not participate fully. We must participate in all sectors, the parishes, in the voivodships, in the central institutions. At the moment, this is not [words indistinct] yet. We can (?dismantle) the system with the elections, with participation. The elections will sort out the political system for us. Of course, today we are looking at the electoral campaign. A lot may not be to our liking here, but this is a step toward normalcy, and this normalcy must bring solutions in the area of the economy, hospitals, pensions—all areas.

It is not that the President or the government are failing to do their duty, or that we do not want to give higher pensions. I do not have enough to do that. Apparently things were better under the communists. Gentlemen, the communists and the old system were on the take to the very end. (?Now they want) autonomy; they want to block legal possibilities, encourage ineffectiveness and anarchy, and to wallow in all this. That is why we should sort all this out while we have the opportunity to do so. It is unfortunate that pensions are so low. They are low because taxes are not being paid, because much of the economy is underground, because the banking law has not been sorted out, other laws have not been sorted out, and discussions are dragging on. Some are doing this on purpose, others because of good democratic slogans. Two forces are colliding: the old, which schemes and puts its hope for survival in anarchy; the new one, which is afraid of dictatorship and supports the same slogans, even though they have noble goals and intentions.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, the public, and, in particular, farmers and workers, have been shocked by your announcement that Poland had 6 billion unused dollars, at a time when our industry and agriculture are in ruins and our fiscal policy, as you know, is in shambles. That comment came from Mr. Mieczyslaw Maslowski from Swidnica in Walbrzych Voivodship.

[Walesa] Again, ladies and gentlemen, what is one supposed to do? It is true; there is about 6 billion dollars available, but no one to use it well. Someone may say, OK, President, you are elected to do it. I am unable, with such laws, such a Parliament, and such powers, to do this. Either democracy and pluralism pass the test and bring about results, or we must recognize that we are different and that they do not work here. I deeply believe in and act in accordance with the system of principles that have passed the test elsewhere in the world. That is why, again, it is necessary for people to take part in the elections and to elect the best people to take this 6 billion and make good use of it. The president cannot do this. Let us sort things out, but do it step by step.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, quite simply, we cannot let this 6 billion be misused, as happened under the previous systems.

[Walesa] Of course, we cannot let this happen again. Someone will say, yes, but we had our government and the president, and they did nothing. This is so, because to a large extent, we were ill prepared for the reforms. We had extra difficulties because we diverted the economy away from a system that had (?deeply ingrained) solutions.

If we want to fit into the world, we have enough humiliations, enough poverty, and the difference between Poles and others. [sentence as heard] We have begun to apply models and systems that were tried and tested elsewhere in the world. That we do not have results immediately? The U.S., German, or other results? Of course, we do not have them, but we are proceeding into solutions that are bound to bring results. Again, this must be improved, but not by boycotting and not by bad elections, but by participation through one's own delegates and by working out structures that Poland needs today. This 6 billion dollars must be invested well. The president is ready and waiting for wise suggestions, which must appear in the law [word indistinct], and everything else is a secondary issue, and I think that [word indistinct].

[Correspondent] Mr. President, you spoke about certain legal inablity, different moves that would help Poland escape the crisis. However, there are many critical words and conclusions concerning your [word indistinct]. During the presidential campaign, you promised to take care of the Polish nation's interests, but later, when you became president, you proposed Jan Krzysztof Bielecki for prime minister, who, together with Deputy Prime Minister Balcerowicz and Minister Lewandowski, brought about economic ruin by selling, almost for nothing, the achievements of many years won by the Polish nation.

[Walesa] Well, again, I would not like to discuss whether my decision was right or reached as a compromise or not. There is a chance to correct even those mistakes the president made. After all, I am learning myself, just as our society is learning. I think we have made great achievements; yet there are many problems that remain unsolved. However, could we do more in two years? Or rather, not even for the whole year? We managed to settle many things on the road to normalcy. Normalcy may be defined in many ways, but I would like to calculate this normalcy in an evident manner. In 1989, leaving for work at the Roundtable, I earned exactly $20 per month under that normalcy. Please check it. If I worked at the shipyard now, I would be earning about $300. Yes, this is the case. Please check it. Between $200 and $300. Looking at it this way—as normalcy in terms of an economic calculation—is that not a great leap in

this direction over two years? Of course, we do not earn as much as they do in the United States. We must transform an economy that was arranged differently. This must enourage us all toward more work and transformation. This has all come to a halt and must take another course. Let us imagine it is still another way, that in England they change the direction of the traffic from the left to the right hand side. Everything, in fact, is in place, but all the exits, all the regulations, all this is in a different direction, and we are in the same situation. (?Cooperation) did develop, things somehow held together, enterprises somehow cooperated, and productivity was low, but there it all was. Now, however, when every enterprise, every institution, must be logical and economically efficient, it transpires that this is an extremely big problem, that new roads must be paved everywhere, and everything costs money. I expected all this, and my idea was to transfer Poland onto the shoulders of Poles [word indistinct] that Poles are poor, so I made a proposal, and I am convinced that we will return to my proposal, and we will give Poland back to the Poles, who will cope will all this themselves.

[Correspondent] A question linked with [word indistinct] of your reply, sir: How long will nomenklatura companies continue to plunder Poland?

[Walesa] As long as Poles do not unite with the president and participate in and protect all this. They can participate today—let me repeat—through their Sejm, which will create a law—this I propose—that there should be no indemnity on any zloty stolen from the Poles. We must square accounts, financial and otherwise, with the past. We must take from everyone and [word indistinct] others. I am surprised. Where are the Polish patriots? Why have they not yet brought back to Poland that fraud, that swindler, who is in Israel? Am I to do it? After all, he stole from and made a fool not only of Walesa but also of all of Poland, and he is now laughing. There is friendship between Israel and Poland. Gentlemen, things cannot be so. That is why, once again, please join in and create a good Parliament the means to create the law and the government and president necessary to implement the law. The president will implement this.

[Correspondent] You spoke earlier, sir, about your $20 to $30 earnings in the shipyard. These earnings have now increased somewhat—which is normal—at least, this is the salary. However, in this case, what is the relation between your salary and that of Mr. Gawronik?

[Walesa] Ladies and gentlemen, there it is: The system that we are building will allow such things, but taxes and the law should regulate it well. I want everyone to earn as much as Gawronik or others, but again our whole tragedy is that the system built by us, and by a society that knows what we are building, knows that if it takes up better positions at the start, then, as in the speedway, there is no way of being overtaken. This is why everyone is trying to get the most, to get into the best position to take advantage of it for himself and his family. This is a certain principle. However, there must be a very good law in such a system. This we do not have; this allows some to outmaneuver the society and to laugh at the ones left behind. This must be done quickly, which is why I am striving so hard to get a wise and good Sejm, so that it does not allow such things. The president does not allow it, but he has no executive power. I want everyone to earn as much as possible. If someone moved in two years from $220 or $200 to $300, to normalcy—because this is how it (?calcluates itself)—this is a great jump. How will we earn as much as they earn in the United States—no less than $2,000 a month. I favor such a wage; this can be done, but the state cannot pay so much to each employee. The employee, together with his president and his Parliament, should organize matters so that it can be possible, so that he has a chance to produce and sell for as much.

We are now standing with one leg in the old system, blocked by those who know it and by the cuts that do not allow us to realize ourselves. This period will continue.

[Correspondent] There is a certain concern, particularly among state sector workers, about the entry of Western capital into the enterprises. Among others, there is this question: What influence does President Walesa have to stop foreign partners from stealing state property. This is from a young employee of a Gdansk shipyard that is still called Komuna Paryska.

[Walesa] Of course, my influence today is small, but tomorrow I may have great influence, when there is a Parliament that represents you, sir, a Parliament that will help the president arrange these things wisely. I feel today that we must achieve that maneuver from my election campaign, to give poor people coming out of the system the chance to take Poland into their own hands. We must give 100 million [currency not specified] in loans so that, in the first place, they can buy that which is Polish, that which is indispensible to Poland, and only in the second place—at least in my opinion—can we, ought we, let in big business. Moreover, even if the citizen who has the chance to buy up assets later establishes contacts with a Western firm, and so forth, then that is his affair, and he has the right to do this. However, we cannot watch over this effectively on the national scale. We cannot allow various unfavorable incidents to occur that are impossible to regulate under this condition of the law and even the government. [sentence as heard]

[Correspondent] In a word, asks Mr. Bachulski, from Warsaw, are not foreign enterprises, by any chance, in Poland a threat to the future of Polish enterprises?

[Walesa] No. Ladies and gentlemen, today's world, today's philosophy, is based on the fact that the more we open up, the more we enable cooperation to take place, the greater the benefits for us. Really, the Polish nation is capable of doing business, capable of being splendid in various spheres, but it never had the opportunity. Today, it is too poor, and that is why I insist, I insist, that we must give Poles the possibility to buy up Poland through mortgages and credits without interest. This must be an opportunity for Poles and not a

situation to make money from Poles. Only afterward should they enter into arrangements with the West. Help me to implement my program.

[Correspondent] The president says: There is no going back on the reforms, reforms based on privatization. It is as if subordinates have only read the first clause of the sentence. Private interests in offices act as a brake on the reforms. How are we to work against this brake? This question is from Jan Kolak. from [name indistinct].

[Walesa] Of course, I do not like this very much. I regret this very much. I am of the people, and I see all this, see the injustice. However, again, I have a choice: to try and choose a dictator's maneuver or to yield to the principles of democracy, to encourage society's participation, and to ensure that we have honest elections so that we can resolve these problems together. I banked on this second option and, of course, I now get criticized for it, for ineffectiveness, for failing my duties. However, as I say, I could only do this with a coup d'etat. However, if I was to do such a thing: first, the whole world would not agree to this; second, I am not capable of doing it; and third, this will not be what we are really building. This is why I am paying, like the rest of society, for the change of the system, hoping that we will make up for it when we understand each other, when we sort things out step by step. Next is sorting out, getting a Parliament, getting executive powers for the president and the government.

[Correspondent] I voted for you; I was with you from the beginning, when the axe was ready. Time to sharpen the axe, says a Gdansk resident.

[Walesa] I have already sharpened it, but I need to be given (?such powers) to be able to use it. Let us have the elections; give me the right to use the axe—not against the citizens, not against democracy, because this is not the right direction—but against all the bad things in Poland. Again, when I spoke about decrees, some said that it was an attempt against democracy; others said it was dangerous, and so on. However, I said that there should be decrees where law is not enough, where the law allows scandals, where the law is bypassed. I wanted the decrees to apply in such places, to block the wrong tendencies and the cheating and so on, to send them to Parliament to be resolved as a priority. So, it was a good idea, an excellent idea, but it was destroyed deliberately by some because they see their advantages in disrupting redemocratization [przedemokratyzowanie] and in reducing governing powers. It also was in the interest of our colleagues, in the interest of well-understood democracy (?and who) blocked their actions.

Today, they remove the possibility of participating in, or in some way guiding, television. They are creating a new force that, in fact, will cause even greater disintegration among us. It will be overdemocratized, independent of everyone; it will, in fact, do what it likes; it will introduce films, pornography, because these make a profit, and no one will have any influence over this, not even the head of state. This is what overdemocratization leads to, of some deliberately and of others in the interests of inconceivable rights.

[Correspondent] Mrs. Barbara, from Warsaw: Why is it that sometimes, Mr. President, you say that you will introduce a state of emergency, and at other times that you will go. You are supposed to create order in Poland, Mr. President. You cannot let people down.

[Walesa] No, I will not let them down; however, I must be understood. It must be understood that some people deliberately do not allow [word indistinct] to carry out this task, by blocking, hanging on to the old laws, creating brakes, and this is precisely in the interests of inefficiency. You have probably noticed that we do not have a bank chief. Look what huge scandals and what chaos there is in the banking system. I do not have a bank chief. I do not have a head of the Supreme Chamber of Control—of course, that was an accident; it is a different matter. There is no order within television today. What is this? This is democracy conceived through a crooked mirror. This cannot be so. Of course, I...[changes thought] Someone might say why, in that case, are these things happening? After the Roundtable, which was a great prize and enabled the next installment of events, I had the choice of continuing this agreement or of totally taking it apart and building a new one. I chose the second path, of taking it apart and building a new one, together with society. Therefore, I could not cultivate the old structures; I could not authorize this Parliament, which was splendid, but for a different time. I had to strive for change. We will probably succeed in this difficult change, but we will only succeed if those who ought to participate do so—those who think they are patriots and not those who cause repugnance, who discourage and count upon making democracy, pluralism, and the ability to decide so horrible that society will not participate, while they do, because they know what is at stake here.

[Correspondent] We have a question from Mr. Zalasinski, a Studio Baltic listener: Do you, sir, as president, not think that the current election campaign creates distaste and disgust among the people? What do we need so many political parties for? For the sake of more comfortable sinecures? The Solidarity bloc is breaking up into the center, the union, and so forth and so on, whereas the left is consolidating itself.

[Walesa] Ladies and gentlemen, after the victory and after the Roundtable, I had a choice: to build a new totalitarianism—even one called Solidarity—or try to share it out, so that many arguments could find their place, and to build (?effects) from the ground up, so to speak. I opted for the second at my cost. After 50 years, when parties have become an abomination, when parties have failed the test, when there is no faith in all that, people only believe in themselves and in those who have been tried and tested by their groups. One must live through this; one must allow it and wait for wisdom, for

reflection, for people to come to their senses. However, here again, for this to occur under democratic conditions, one must show everything—the ridiculous and stupid things, the lack of competence—so that wisdom can win. We are now in the hard school of taking a look at ourselves and now...[changes thought] And the other road is a different one [words indistinct]. After the Roundtable [words indistinct] and later, the strength of Solidarity could have been imposed, which would have replaced, would have entered, the old system (?at the bottom), dug itself in and kept everybody else out. Foreseeing that this could happen, I opted for the second. I paid a terrible price. I do not know whether that road was the right one. Maybe those elites would have turned out to be capable of keeping society out and of creating happiness in Poland. It will take a bit longer, but it is coming from the bottom. It is funny; it is sometimes insulting, but it is something we must go through as a society on the way to normalcy.

[Correspondent] A very down-to-earth question from a Gliwice listener: What about Saturdays off? This is one of the Gdansk agreement demands.

[Walesa] That is a question from another era. Ladies and gentlemen, of course, in a system where the gentlemen from Gliwice owns his own factory, let him take an entire week off; let him take it! Let him pay his taxes to the state from what he has. That is alright by me. I am in favor of entire weeks off, but the only thing is: Who will pay for it?

Today, there is no money for hospitals, no money for schools. Why? Because people do not pay taxes. Someone would say: Yes, because of Balcerowicz, because the economy has strangled all this. Yes, large steel works, industry, have been strangled, and this is a certain regularity. A mistake that I have pointed out, and I still do, was that we had no Balcerowicz's twin, because following the correct actions by Balcerowicz, the second Balcerowicz would collect all the unemployed, all the bad machinery, and then try to link them up to the new blood circulation. This is what that $6 billion was for. Until today, we have not created a second Balcerowicz, who should have (?500) people who would inspect voivodships suddenly and check how many unemployed there are, and in what professions, decide what possibilities there are. They would organize these and initiate action.

[Correspondent] There would not be [words indistinct].

[Walesa] There would not be (?emptiness) [word indistinct]. This is a mistake. However, could one avoid making this mistake? It seems to me that one could more quickly correct this mistake, but again, how can it be corrected when the law does not allow for it, when the government has difficulties, when Parliament is discussing something else? These are parliamentary laws. Today, all this is not yet fine tuned. There is one new shoe, but the other shoe is old.

[Correspondent] [words indistinct] Let us leave (?free Saturdays) [words indistinct] and go over to problems of people who generally have difficulties with work. How many millions should the so-called hygienic unemployment amount to, and what possibilities, Mr. President, do you see for these people?

[Walesa] I repeat what I already said during the electoral campaign: Poland cannot afford unemployment; yes, it cannot afford it. We have so much work to be done in every respect, but we cannot...[changes thought] Those helpless, poor, unemployed, and dismissed...[changes thought] There is no Balcerowicz who has money, even for managing these means and resources. This is why one must be involved, so that people will notice the presidency's idea. It is good, and I will praise myself, just as all other ideas were good. They must be implemented. It is necessary to help the president because he has a program, and he knows how to implement it.

I have accumulated, together with others, assets for this, but I do not have the executive power. The law is somewhere else and does not allow action. However, I have no grudge against anyone either. I agreed to this kind of thing and did not carry out a coup. I (?counted on) somebody noticing, on you noticing, (?that it was legal). In the future Parliament, you (?will do) it together with me.

[Correspondent] There is a hole in the budget somewhere. A listener demands that things be taken from former Communists. Why should people like Cimoszewicz and Kwasniewski still be appearing on television every other day?

[Walesa] Because you are not there, sir. I do not like it either. Accounts must be settled. I am in favor of that. I am at your disposal, but for me to settle accounts, I will telephone the prosecutor: Mr. Prosecutor, please—this is not my line—please make an act, not a single zloty should be overlooked, no indemnity. Please see to all these matters and (?report to me). There is a law as it stands, and it requires that it must be applied against everyone and that ways and means must be found for everyone, so that [words indistinct] so that nobody can evade it and make fools of us all. Today...[changes thought] And who will carry it out? The State Protection Office, the police, and the prosecutor's office. All this is from the old era. There, people went in with money, people went into the old arrangements, which still exist and that cannot be done by wishing or even by deciding. [sentence as heard] I want to do it; I am doing it [word indistinct], but only with help, only with the law, only with a good Parliament that notices all this. Today, in the campaign, ii will tell you yes, it will implement it and [word indistinct] do it as quickly as possible.

[Correspondent] Let us go on now to the questions concerning what we might describe as the secrets of the Belvedere. How much does the president of the Republic earn?

[Walesa] Probably around 8 million a month, but here again, for a family of ten, it is...[changes thought] It is as it is. I want to say that, of course, at various times I had various choices: either live on that starvation wage—like society—or get smart, like many people got smart [word indistinct] and try to make money on Western capital, on other [word indistinct]. I wrote one book; I wrote another; I got a lot of money for that. I also tried to make a film. The position you worked out for me allowed me to moonlight in the old period.

That is why [words indistinct]. Therefore, I am surprised how you manage to live, how society is making ends meet. These are hunger rations, but not because the president does not want to give or does not know how to give, but because the president must do it within the limits of the system under construction. This is why I want to earn more with you; there is a chance for it, but to achieve this, we must sort things out, step by step. There is a chance of sorting out the most important thing in two weeks: the right for the deputies to speak about what you are ringing me up with now, so that the deputies divide it all nicely and return Poland to the Poles, implementing the president's program. Things will then be better, faster. Or—and I am speaking about the elections, too—you are demanding a program from me, and life will bring another program. Someone says: Tell us your program. There it is. I was right when I said: Listen, I cannot have a program because it depends on the government, on the Parliament, on the old law. It transpired that I was right.

Today, there is a question for the president: Will he implement—and society agrees with it—his program—that is, return [word indistinct] 100 million, introduce decrees in place of empty laws or bad laws? Or will the Parliament elected by you, and later the government, produce another program? I will then have to tell society: The Sejm and the government program selected by you is different. Hence, the question is raised: Am I to break with my program and—as I promised you—join the Parliament and the government? Or am I to try and implement my own program (?to satisfy) the expectations?

I have a year for this, which is why I am not bringing in my wife. That is why I do not commit myself to the office of the president, because I have no answer to this question. I came to accomplish everything but to accomplish it within the limits of norms, decency, and the system, which would not cause restiveness.

[Correspondent] Another question from "The Mysteries of the Belvedere" series. Who governs in the Belvedere? The president? Or his secretary? Who is minister (?Wachowski)? (?Is he a president or censor)? These are questions from Mr. Kochanczyk from Gdansk; Mr. and Mrs. Tomaszewski from Tczew; and Stanislaw Kaczynski from Gliwice.

[Walesa] It depends on what you define as governing. If the president is in a car, then the president's driver rules, and he can then crash into a post. He can, if they pay him well: He can crash sideways and walk out of it in one piece. If someone asks who rules in the kitchen, what do they feed me to put me in a good mood, well, it is the cook, and she can even add some poison. If someone asks who makes the decisions, well, of course, I make them myself, and no one manipulates me, although he might desire to do so very much. However, this is a complicated office, which receives all sorts of information. I believe or do not believe it, I try myself and, in many cases here and there, one can meet various barriers. However, I would like to say that I have people with whom I agree, with whom I bear no grudges, because if I did, they would not be working with me. That is why we act in unison, we make mistakes, we admit to them, but it is I who chose them, and I will implement the program with them.

[Correspondent] Mr. Waclaw Bregman, a Warsaw listener, raises the following matter: I observe at the beginning of the president's term of office a tendency to offend his person, to ridicule and ignore him. The following question ought to be asked: How is this possible?

[Walesa] Of course, many things overlap here. Many people worked very hard, they studied, yet a man with a lower education is here, and this is perhaps not even educational and should not be so; thus, it can create jealousy. I also agree with this. I think that we must study. I would like to say that I studied a lot, study now, and will continue to study, but I do not strive for pieces of paper. Many people think that a piece of paper is more important than what one does. However, this is [word indistinct]. We can discuss it from various angles. I know that we will be judged by our work. Over 20 years, I managed to lead—even if they did not listen during that difficult period—to lead without firing a shot, to overcome a very difficult system, and no one believed this. Yet, I succeeded. I have now succumbed to the temptation of leading Poland to normalcy. I must say that when I look at all this from a distance, we are succeeding splendidly, but it costs. It costs too much.

However, again, because the cost is high, it does not mean that the president is not good or that he does not have a paper with a certain inscription, but that means that others do not enter the areas won by the president, that they do not cooperate and do not help. It is difficult to give help from a small town, but if one truly believes in what one does, one could help in another way. One could elect a good village elder, and satisfaction in the village would have its impact on satisfaction in the voivodship, and so on. So, let us believe in ourselves, let us believe that Poland is free and that what we will do depends upon each of us—once by voting, another time by words—and nobody is going to stop us. [sentence as heard] We are still unable, but where could we learn that. We are creating structures that are normal. When I talked about these dollars, this is normal, too. This is insufficient, this is not enough, but this is a great leap and is the opening to the whole of Europe and to the world. Somebody had to do it. We have great achievements, great possibilities, and big money, but the participation in it all, physical participation, will allow for faster resolution of

problems, for wiser solutions on pensions and on putting a stop to crimes. The participation, as the president will not manage alone. [sentence as heard]

[Correspondent] Speaking of money, Mr. President, who pays for Mrs. Walesa's travels and trips by ministers and parliamentarians? A listener refers, in particular, to a recent parliamentarian's visit to the PRC.

[Walesa] Ladies and gentlemen, I have encountered it at the Belvedere myself. This is great anarchy; there is no register; nobody knows who those magnificent paintings belongs to; there is a mess because everything was above the law. That is why I asked the Supreme Chamber of Control to put everything in order in the Belvedere, in the chancellery, and I will ask the prime minister and Parliament to do the same. The situation there has been, more or less, the same. Nobody knows who is responsible, to whom it belongs. One can change it; one can roll up a carpet and lay another one. One must put it all in order.

I know that Poland cannot be left like this, that we must start from somewhere. That was bad; an account should be drawn up, but we must draw the line and from that line (?this house) will all be Polish, all of it. It will all be controlled. If you are talking about my wife, ladies and gentlemen, all the trips, nearly all the trips—and that trip for the St. Bridget's celebrations—were financed, every penny, by the Brigettine Order as a present for Mrs. Walesa. Nothing was taken from the state and cannot be. I take very great care and save the state treasury money. This cannot be seen; I am not going to explain, people, that I have not taken a zloty. I would not allow it, not even for my wife. All the trips, all the trips, must be worthwhile for me. I count everything precisely; that is why I do not squander Poland; I do not go on trips that often. When I travel, I arrange money; I arrange it audaciously. That is why I showed some [word indistinct] even those talks with the greatest people of the world. People thought: What have they got to talk about? What are they talking about? Who is paying for it? I showed that it was not like that. We were talking normally. Look how we are also sorting out normal issues outright, not fearing or being concerned about all those things. That is how I think I will carry on, and I do not think about taking one zloty or one dollar for my own private purpose or for my wife's. I would not allow that.

[Correspondent] (?And what about trips by parliamentarians)? Naturally, it is a question of the trip to the PRC.

[Walesa] Sir, there were an awful lot to these trips. If there was some kind of insult, if we behaved in some kind of imperfect way, it was terribly blown out of proportion. However, there were an awful lot of parliamentary trips and [word indistinct]. I cannot negate them because people will say that I am striking out at Parliament. I am not striking out at it. I think that in Parliament, administratively and generally, travel is not regulated. I will ask the Supreme Chamber of Control, without insulting Parliament, to sort out those matters: Who? How much? Where from? What right does he have? To whom does this picture belong? Does he have the right to travel?

I must do this, because things cannot stay this way. I do not know how it happens. Looking around Belvedere Palace, I think that it was all above the law; everybody could take state property (?as if) it belonged to them. I will clear these matters up, and I will intervene for order where possible, but without offending Parliament, without offending the government, but still create order.

[Correspondent] [words indistinct] question. Things were supposed to have gotten better after six months. Everyone can see how things are. Blame is now being placed on the contract Sejm; earlier, it was placed on the Reds; tomorrow, on whom will it be placed?

[Walesa] No, ladies and gentlemen. I know that we very quickly forget what we are coming out of and what we must do. The enormity of tasks, this enormity, this is an entire blood circulation system running the opposite way, another form of cooperation. This is a painful problem, a huge reform, but, ladies and gentlemen, are we going in the direction of tried and trusted models? Of course, things are bad, but could things have been different? What can we do with these monsters that Communism constructed. What could we have done with this senseless (?out of place) production. Well, this must be changed, but to change it, we must have a different law, and we must have both the means and the resources. We are doing this; we have great, really great achievements, but it is extremely costly. I repeat, our greatest mistake was that the period leading up to the elections lasted too long and that there was no second Balcerowicz. If he had managed those resources that remain within society, if a second Balcerowicz had made good use of money, there would now be a different Poland. However, once again, for this to happen, we really do need greater participation. No one will put Poland's house in order for us. We have two roads: dictatorship by Walesa or someone else, or democracy, which exists, elections which exist, in order for the best programs and the smartest people to get through, to have influence on the very top (?and on decisions). That is what democracy is for; that is what pluralism is for; that is what all these arguments are for.

It is good that they are. They must make accession possible for the best of all people and all programs, even from the existing parties. However, the choice belongs to the public. Nonparticipation will make it possible for the studpid and the weak to carry on doing what they have been doing, and let us applaud them, because you have given them possibilities by not participating. [sentence as heard]

[Correspondent] Who will take the blame if it does not succeed. Walesa? Balcerowicz? The people? Cimoszewicz?

[Walesa] We all will share the blame, with the president at the helm, as he did not strike sparks out of people, he

did not encourage, and he did not convince. I want to convince, and I am trying to convince, and I am making an appeal. This is all yours; it has been managed badly because you had no influence on things. You can now have influence. Let us together elect the best; let us elect and improve. I am at your disposal, and I am ready to serve and to deliver all I have promised. However, I need your participation and your approval to do it. Some people tell me about dictatorship, others about democracy. I am for democracy.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, our time is coming to an end. What about our entry into Europe? Will Poland gain entry? Many say that we have always been in Europe.

[Walesa] Yes, we have. However, let us remember that we are truly sentimental people. Nobody will give us anything. They gained in Yalta at our expense; they gained during the Communist rule; they got us into debt by giving money to Communists, and today they want to make a profit as well. However, I said it outright. Somebody always tried to make a profit, and we were always suffering. Now, let us not allow that; let us be wiser. We are quite wise. Let us do everything to represent ourselves, and do not let others treat us unfavorably in Europe and in the world.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, thank you for the conversation and for a 60-minute meeting with Radio Poland First Program listeners. We managed to ask only 37 questions of the over 100 we prepared.

[Walesa] I am at your disposal. If I have not offended the people, if I have not been tactless—as I am always guided by emotions—we can return to our conversation. Next week, we will have an hour of question and answer on television and, in this regard, I am ready. I am not afraid of anybody. I have nothing on my conscience to be ashamed of. Let us do it.

[Correspondent] Thank you, very much.

Prime Minister Bielecki Discusses Election Issues

PM1810101791 Krakow GAZETA KRAKOWSKA in Polish 8 Oct 91 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Prime Minister Jan Krzysztof Bielecki by correspondent Leslaw Maleszka; place and date not given]

[Text] [Maleszka] The election campaign has provided an opportunity for many political forces on the right and on the left of the political spectrum to launch a campaign of criticism—occasionally most aggressive criticism—against your cabinet.

[Bielecki] Apart from the hundred-plus registered political parties, the 60 parties that actually take part in the election, and the nearly 9,000 parliamentary (Sejm and Senate) candidates, we still have the general public, who display a medium level of involvement in the political divisions between the left and the right. Aggressive stances are mostly limited to some candidate Sejm deputies and candidate senators. Some of them, in their desire to prove to the public that they can fight for the latter's interests, believe that the best thing they can do is to organize a hunger strike or protest action. This creates the impression of an outright and coordinated attack on the government.

We are trying, on the one hand, to secure support from the president and, on the other, to find the backing of that part of the public that is convinced that the road we have chosen is neither miraculous nor short and fast, but that it is still the only possible road to choose if we want to build a strong state within the current decade.

And I believe that—provided that the election goes reasonably well, the turnout is reasonably high, and the number of political groups that will ultimately gain access to Parliament is a dozen or so, rather than thirty-odd—the political scene should become more settled, even though the next year will still be far from easy.

I Refuse To Be a Pawn in the Game

[Maleszka] How do you assess Lech Walesa's support for your cabinet?

[Bielecki] I value it very highly indeed, especially during the tougher moments—for example, during the celebrated and protracted row over the "popiwek" [tax on wages above the normative limits] law. In February, at a rather crucial moment, the president's advisory committee issued a statement in which they refused to offer any support for the government, and which we, in turn, could not possibly accept for specific substantive reasons. At that time, the president's own declaration offering backing for my cabinet proved extremely helpful.

As I approach the end of my term of office, I should like to state that the president fully demonstrated his firm trust in the government. I am not sure whether the cabinet, in turn, fully justified his trust, but we were operating in an unusual period and under extraordinary circumstances. We must also remember one factor that Lech Walesa's adversaries quite possibly overlook: the president is ensconced in the Belvedere Palace for a period of five years, and it is from that perspective that he makes his major decisions.

[Maleszka] Why did you not take advantage of Lech Walesa's proposal—made a few months ago—to force legislation through the Sejm granting extraordinary powers for the government? You invoked that project again at a time when it was already clear that the Sejm would not approve such a proposal.

[Bielecki] On the one hand it is a question of principle that all matters within the purview of legislative authority should be decided in Parliament. On the other hand, the situation in the Sejm has changed since the president came out with the proposal in question—and, unfortunately, it changed for the worse. Let me just remind you that the employment and unemployment bill is still not a valid law, although journalists have been

pointing out the problem of apparent unemployment for about a year now. So it would be hard to claim that the Sejm is highly efficient in its work.

I refuse to be a pawn in the game, a figure who can be appointed and recalled at will, and "positioned" here or there, as is currently expedient—10 billion zlotys to turn left or 10 billion zlotys to turn right—because the Polish state must also continue after the election. The special powers we applied for were intended to enable us to carry out a number of tasks. For example, we were hoping to make good the mistake that was made last year over the retirement pay act.

[Maleszka] One charge, in particular, is often leveled against your cabinet: That you allowed members of the government to be involved in economic joint ventures.

[Bielecki] Of course, I was well aware of the great risk I was taking when making that decision. I should even say that, today, I would think twice about the advisability of making it. However, I simply abhor the game of appearances and facades. I asked our office of legal advisers to clarify our position, and I was told that the ban issued by Prime Minister Mazowiecki constituted an infringement of individuals' civil rights. What is more, that ban did not extend to stopping a minister's wife from holding shares in an economic venture. In other words, the ban virtually generated a variety of informal ways to "bypass" it—for, after all, I can always transfer my shares in a company to a third party for the duration of my term of office.

I wanted to solve the whole problem comprehensively. First, everyone who comes to work in the government should declare his assets clearly. Second, if he comes to join the government as an already established businessman, he cannot have everything taken away from him. In any case, the scale of this phenomenon is negligible. Third and last, we should adopt solutions modeled on those applied in Western Europe, where government members declare their financial status at the beginning of their term in office and update the declaration every six months.

We must not do things only for the sake of preserving a facade to keep up appearances and prevent the public from "nitpicking." If I wanted to be mean, I would suggest that we take a close look at the Telegraf company. Formally, everything is in perfect order: No member of the President's Chancellery is involved in this joint venture. And now we can begin to speculate whether the Krakow-based Industrial and Commercial Bank had no better ideas on where to invest its capital than in the Telegraf company....

[Maleszka] It is an undisputed fact that the unmasking of economic rackets has become the number one topic on the agenda of very many politicians.

[Bielecki] Every racket is different and has its own specific nature. The crime detection apparatus still suffers from a shortage of expert personnel specialized in the difficult art of economic and financial frauds. In addition, there are loopholes in existing legislation that were simply not noticed before and that are now responsible for a veritable sense of high panic among the staff of the Finance Ministry. I do not know how they will cope with it now. Because we can either opt for the conspiracy theory, which claims that the ministry is peopled exclusively by agents who live off illegal earnings made on the side, or else assume that, like any other ministry, it employs normal people working under conditions of considerable tension and stress—and for negligible salaries to boot—and reluctant to go on suffering this constant barrage of accusations leveled against them. We are currently conducting a considerable number of investigations, and we have submitted quite a few cases for the attention of the prosecutor's office, but all this requires consistency in our position and strict adherence to the letter of the law.

We Are Moving Toward a Europe of Regions

[Maleszka] Certain groups are opposed to the idea of Poland's accession to the European Community. They warn of the danger of an expansion of German capital taking over our market.

[Bielecki] It is hardly surprising that such sentiments and such fears persist. We are heirs to a bad historical legacy. My own grandfather was killed on the second day of the last war, executed by the German army unit whose specific task after entering the town of Chojnice was to "hunt him out" and kill him. But the main question for us now is: Are we going to look back forever, or shall we start looking forward? Looking at our attitude from the prospect of tomorrow and the future to follow, certain things are very clear: As we join the family of democratic countries, we must face and acknowledge the fact that we are neighbors with Germany. It is not possible for Poles to become active members of the united states of Europe over the heads of the Germans. Integration processes lead us in the direction of a Europe of regions, rather than a Europe of separate states, each surrounded by a cordon of troops and barbed wire fences.

[Maleszka] What stand will the government take on the conflict between the Polish ethnic minority and the authorities in independent Lithuania?

[Bielecki] I believe that, at this point, we must be careful not to take offense. On the contrary, we must consider very carefully whether we should not extend a hand to Lithuanians without quoting any terms or conditions. On the one hand, we must clearly keep in view the rights of Poles in Wilenszczyzna [Lithuanian regions belonging to Poland before World War II]. These rights are, quite simply, enshrined in the standards of European and international law, in the Copenhagen declaration, and in CSCE documents. On the other hand, however, we must also understand that a certain process is involved here, because if Lithuania wants to be accepted in international organizations, it must recognize the absolute

necessity to comply with these standards. This is why the only way in which we can solve existing problems is through political dialogue.

[Maleszka] Let me recall here the comment made by Jan Parys after the 28 August Belvedere Palace conference. He stated that "the ambiguity of the declaration issued by the Liberal Democratic Congress" would be "cited in historical studies." The ambiguity of the quoted document was supposed to rest on the declared readiness to launch cooperation between Poland and the organizers of the military coup in Moscow.

[Bielecki] First of all, this is a classic example of textual manipulation, where passages are quoted out of the context of the full text of declaration. Second, I do not want to reveal any secrets here, but I can say in more general terms that we—and I myself—managed to preserve exceptional presence of mind in the days of the coup, which cannot be said of certain other persons. Moreover, a lower-rank civil servant like Mr. Parys should concentrate on discharging his civil service duties instead of launching into public pursuit of politics and issuing assessments of the government. Otherwise, he faces the danger of developing a schizophrenic split between his position as a private citizen and that of a public official. I hope that the coming parliamentary election will finally put an end to similar practices and that, subsequently, every civil servant will concentrate on the public role for the performance of which he draws his state salary.

I Will Not Wash My Hands of Balcerowicz

[Maleszka] Assuming that your hands are not in any way tied, who would you nominate as your deputy prime minister and the finance minister?

[Bielecki] First, we must complete a certain stage in the process of changes. And, given the situation we have here today, I will certainly not wash my hands of Leszek Balcerowicz. Balcerowicz is not so much a symbol of a good or bad finance minister as he is a symbol of a certain direction of the reform process in Poland. Many of his adversaries are, in effect, proposing that we return to the system of "socialism with a human face," or "a centrally controlled market economy." If this is to be the proposed alternative, then at this stage, we must follow Balcerowicz with firm determination.

[Maleszka] In other words, all the various programs suggested by proponents of the so-called "third option" are, in your opinion, examples of intentional deception, are they not?

[Bielecki] If you read Janos Kornai's "The Road to a Free Economy," you will come across the following statement: All who consider themselves socialists and believe that the state's most important task is to protect the poorest social strata should, first and foremost, declare whether they are in favor of high inflation or against it.

[Maleszka] Do you often find yourself in dispute with Balcerowicz?

[Bielecki] We do have differences of opinion, which is not a secret. These follow from a variety of causes, one of which is the difference between our respective "career paths," as they call them in the West, which imply different perspectives from which we view present-day reality. All in all, the differences are an advantage, because we occupy mutually complementary rather than rival positions.

[Maleszka] Incidentally, let me point out that the conscience of a genuine liberal should protest against the concept of privatization as developed by a circle of Liberal Democratic Congress activists. After all, the author you mentioned, Kornai, is a sworn enemy of the idea of "free privatization."

[Bielecki] Of course. The term "liberalism" is used today as a blanket term to define our group and also to induce hatred among the population, on the lines of: Things will get better when the liberals are gone. I believe that liberalism will be at the core of Poland's future. These days, however, in many specific matters, government policy is still far removed from liberal principles. What kind of liberalism is it when wages are controlled and, at the same time, there is no free labor market? What kind of liberalism is it when customs tariffs are constantly being raised? I have been sharply admonished by Milton Friedmann, who is otherwise a good personal friend, for this lack of consistency: "Have you gone mad, sticking to such a stiff currency exchange rate?

Thus, we do not follow some doctrinaire collection of views, but progress along the path of practical solutions within the framework of certain general principles.

[Maleszka] I should like to hear your comments on a document that has been invoked by the press particularly often in recent weeks. I am referring to "Tenets of Social and Economic Policy for 1992" elaborated by the Central Planning Office. The "Tenets" came into being as part of the government's work, but surely they propose a program for a "centrally steered market economy," do they not?

[Bielecki] Let me speak to you "as one soldier to another." Minister Eysymontt has a problem with a precise definition of his role. On the one hand, he is, of course, a member of the Council of Ministers and, as such, co-responsible for government policies; on the other hand, the Central Planning Office has certain leanings toward becoming an independent institute for the study and analysis of trends present in our economy. Such a divergence of goals can develop into a schizophrenic condition if it persists long enough. It is also a consequence of the faulty structure of central administration agencies inherited as a legacy of the previous system. And if we add to all this a measure of election rhetoric....

[Maleszka] From a minister?

[Bielecki] Well, there you are, you see. You could say that it was also, to a certain degree, my mistake. To begin with, I believed that the government constituted quite simply a team of people who would be efficient administrators in their respective allocated fields, within the domain of managing the state. But it soon turned out that, in line with the majority of forces in our society, the government has become highly politicized, its members opting for membership of various political parties. I suddenly found out that, at this highest level of power, we have 26 candidates intending to contest Sejm and Senate seats in the coming election, and also six members of various political parties. This is quite a lot.

Wearing the Industry Minister's Hat

[Maleszka] Over the past months, you have traveled around the country visiting many enterprises. Have these visits brought any concrete results?

[Bielecki] It is true that, since last May, I virtually took on a new post and donned the hat of an industry minister, so to speak, though that was certainly not my original aim. However, the processes that we now observe taking place in enterprises often necessitate drastic operations on the living tissue—or perhaps the living wounds—of our society. And if we want to carry out these operations, we must prepare a favorable climate first. Second, my visits were designed to generate a broad discussion of the desired positive changes in enterprises. So it was not at all like good old uncle Bielecki coming to visit with a sackful of money, which is then used to get something positive done in the given enterprise. On the contrary, I would usually first state firmly that we intended to liquidate the enterprise, regardless of whether the work force decided to strike or not, and then I would suggest that those interested should prepare a sensible program to rescue the enterprise, assuring them that only such a program could have a chance to secure government support. But, to start with, they would have to stop wondering only how to allocate another sum of money from last year's profits and.... "after us the deluge...."

[Maleszka] I do not want to bother you about details, but I am interested in the general problem of a certain apparent lack of cohesion in the government's policies. The problem has, in any case, been mentioned already in this conversation. I do not know whether it is really necessary to build a continuous steel casting line at the Sendzimir Steel Plant. This is a question for the experts to pore over. On the other hand, I could not but note that one day the steel plant received a visit from Central Planning Office vice minister Karol Szwarc, who declared that the government would extend loan guarantees to launch that particular investment project, and two days later the Industry Ministry issued a comment in which it stated that the government had not yet arrived at a decision on the matter and that, in any case, loan guarantees should be extended by banks rather than the State Treasury. Krakow—alongside Gdansk—is necessarily seen as "the provinces," as opposed to the seat of central administration, and such contradictory declarations are bound to generate unfavorable comments.

[Bielecki] Indeed. First, we have the structure of the government, which cannot be changed from one day to the next. You know very well that the setting up of the Ministry of Industry and Commerce took all of four months. The role of the Central Planning Office in the new economic reality is quite unclear. It continues to monitor central investment projects, but it also has a certain range of competence with regard to decisionmaking. Bureaucracy tends to gain in self-importance when it has some asset at its disposal—when it is in a position to give something someone wants or to make a decision someone wants. Then it begins to expand and, what is worse, to become politicized. This will be particularly dangerous after the election, because it is quite hard to imagine that a single political group will be capable of forming a government.

Second, an analysis of the situation in the metallurgical sector is currently under way, and I believe that some time in October we will already know the specific answer about the future of the Sendzimir Steel Plant.

You May Be Afraid, But You Must Act All the Same

[Maleszka] With whom would the Liberal Democratic Congress want to join forces in a coalition in the future government?

[Bielecki] I believe that the proportion of the "old" political groups, so to speak, should try even harder now to prove their usefulness when it comes to building Poland today, tomorrow, and the next day. Second, the key to a coalition must be joint agreement to implement a package of very specific actions and a precise timetable of operations. The package must be formulated much more precisely than any election program. Otherwise, no coalition, whether based on mutual affinities or a claim to "shared roots," will stand a chance of lasting long. Third, who told you that the Liberal Democratic Congress will want to enter a coalition at all? You should address this question to the party's leader, Donald Tusk, not to me.

[Maleszka] Election posters display your photograph with the following caption: "Do Not Be Afraid of Tomorrow." Do you believe that the voters will put their trust in this slogan?

[Bielecki] In the film, "One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest," there is a scene where Jack Nicholson makes a bet with the inmates of the psychiatric hospital—none of whom, incidentally, are insane—that he can pull out the massive marble surround of the washbasin.

[Maleszka] And he loses the bet, but he still challenges the spiritless and apathetic patients with the defiant claim: "At least I tried!"

[Bielecki] Precisely. And one of the patients, an Indian, places his trust in this attitude—perhaps too strongly? In

the last scene, he pulls out the surround, hurls it against the bars, smashes them and escapes to freedom.

Thus, as long as we are agreed on the state's basic strategic targets, we may be afraid of what tomorrow will bring, but we should still act to try and reach them.

[Maleszka] Thank you for talking to us.

KLD Leader Discusses Possible Political Allies

AU1410084591 Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA in Polish 7 Oct 91 pp 12-13

[Interview with Lech Mazewski, deputy chairman of the Liberal Democratic Congress, by Artur Domoslawski and Piotr Pacewicz; place and date not given: "Liberals of all Camps Unite"]

[Excerpts] [GAZETA WYBORCZA] The Liberal Democratic Congress [KLD] proposes strengthening the position of the president. Is such a system better than the classic parliamentary democracy? Or is it a question of choosing the lesser evil...?

[Mazewski] Although our roots are in conservative thought, that is not what led us to choose this particular institutional setup. Poland needs strong executive authority. Our decision to elect a president directly dictates a certain logic.

Let us recall that in prewar Poland, the National Democrats sought to avoid giving the president real powers, solely because the president would have been Pilsudski, but that was what paved the way for the coup.

In the difficult process of constructing a state—then as now—there has to be someone who has real power to govern while, at the same time, bearing responsibility for the exercise of power. That is the concept that we are proposing. It is to be a safeguard against resorting to dictatorship.

[GAZETA WYBORCZA] Has there been a danger of presidential dictatorship at some point in the past few months, or are you just theorizing?

[Mazewski] I am thinking more of the future. Let us imagine the following situation: We elect a fragmented Parliament in the fall. Under the current procedural framework, the Sejm may be unable to appoint a government within three months. The president then dissolves the Parliament in the spring. New elections based on the same electoral code are called, and a fragmented Parliament is elected once again, and that is how it goes on....

Then, the following question inevitably arises: What will happen next to democracy in Poland, when there are increasing, widespread demands from people that someone should finally start governing in this state?

This may give rise to a climate that would favor authoritarian measures and public acceptance of such measures. Because I fear this, I am trying to come to grips with the situation now and propose a solution that would save us from dictatorship or would at least create an opportunity to avoid it. [passage omitted]

[GAZETA WYBORCZA] You advocate the concept of building a strong center- right camp. How do you envisage that?

[Mazewski] Many center-right groups, which currently have different structures, traditions and so on, will enter the new Sejm. In due course, we will realize that there are more issues uniting us than dividing us.

There are three issues that already unite us today: strengthening executive authority, political support for market-oriented economic reforms, and decentralization in Poland, that is, the creation of an efficient local government system and strong regions.

[GAZETA WYBORCZA] Who are the "we" who are united by all these things?

[Mazewski] The main post-"Solidarity" forces came into being for short-term, tactical reasons. The Democratic Union is an association that has been formed around the person of Tadeusz Mazowiecki, and the Center Accord was formed around the call to change the way in which governmental power is exercised. At the last moment, it transpired that this is what one calls Christian democracy. I think that, in their present form, these structures will not survive beyond the elections.

Recently, for example, Mazowiecki said that he is an advocate of a presidential-parliamentary system. That just takes one's breath away! He is also an advocate of the market economy, so it turns out that there are no fundamental programmatic differences between us.

However, these views are not held by everyone in the Union. The draft constitution that was drawn up by the Constitutional Commission, which is chaired by Boleslaw Geremek, does not tend to lean in that direction.

[GAZETA WYBORCZA] Are you counting on a split in the Union or on its evolution in a liberal direction?

[Mazewski] People who hold such different views on every important Polish issue cannot remain together in one party. The person of Mazowiecki will not be enough to hold these people together for long. A center-right tendency of the kind I am talking about is emerging around the Union's Democratic Right Faction.

[GAZETA WYBORCZA] And what about the Center Accord?

[Mazewski] The Center Accord is in a different situation. The polls show that the level of support for it is about 3 to 4 percent, but I hope that they will obtain 10 to 12 percent, because that will make it easier to create a post-"Solidarity" government, regardless of what Jaroslaw Kaczynski is saying today.

However, if the result is like the one indicated by opinion polls, then the Center Accord will not survive.

The Christian democrat and liberal currents that are present in it will begin to look for a new place for themselves.

[GAZETA WYBORCZA] However, it would seem that Lech Walesa gave his support to the party by receiving the Center Accord's leaders recently....

[Mazewski] I do not think so. After all, the president has also had meetings with Tadeusz Mazowiecki, with Donald Tusk, and even with Stanislaw Tyminski.

[GAZETA WYBORCZA] So, who exactly would form the center-right?

[Mazewski] Apart from our Congress, it would include part of what is currently the Democratic Union, the Republican Coalition, and the Christian Democrats Party. There are also a lot of smaller groups that are situated between the Democratic Union and the Christian National Union, such as, for example, the Upper Silesian Union, which aims to combine political and economic liberalism with the Christian tradition.

The creation of a strong center-right will succeed on the condition that a government is formed in the fall (and, thus, that the Parliament survives), and that the government produces a more stable situation for, let us say, the next two years. [passage omitted]

Walesa Views Current Problems in Europe

AU1810091391 Prague RESPEKT in Czech No. 40, 7-13 Oct 91 p 13

[Interview with President Lech Walesa by Petr Janyska in Warsaw before the CSFR, Hungary, and Poland summit: "We Are at a Crossroads"]

[Text] The presidents, prime ministers, and large delegations from three Central European countries met in Krakow over the weekend to establish in which areas it would be advantageous to proceed jointly, and to display their closer ties by issuing a joint declaration and signing bilateral agreements. The European Community made it plain that it perceives us as a homogeneous whole and that the possible spread of the Yugoslav conflict across the Hungarian borders, as well as the disintegration of the USSR and the consequences of economic reform, affect all three countries.

Shortly before the summit, Lech Walesa granted the following interview to RESPEKT in the Belvedere presidential palace. In his interview, he summarizes his work to date and his ideas about a new and open Europe, a Europe that will perhaps forget past wrongdoings and will begin to look ahead in search of common interests:

[Janyska] Mr. President, in your presidential campaign last year you said that the changes were slow in your country and that it was necessary to "accelerate" them. How much have you succeeded in that?

[Walesa] I considered the fast implementation of changes to be very desirable and, I believe, I have accelerated these changes to a fair extent since last year. However, at the very beginning, I realized that I would not be able to work with Parliament. If I were meeting with groups of deputies in which there were 65 percent communists and only 35 percent of our people, it would have meant that I had approved this configuration and these forces. This is why I gave up cooperating with Parliament and did my best to dissolve it. We have communist laws that we had to change. Laws are amended in Parliament, and Parliament slowed down and blocked my efforts to accelerate changes.

Maybe everything could have been done faster, but I paid for the fact that we were the first. During our roundtable talks with the communists, we showed that the Eastern bear was not that horrible—that he would not intervene. Others could have followed our example and have proceeded further, and did do so.

The balance of forces marred my efforts to accelerate the changes. This balance of forces was at variance with the freely elected president. Maybe I will make up for the losses with a new Parliament, which, contrary to the existing one, will have a mandate for cooperation, as I do.

[Janyska] Were the special powers for the government meant as a part of the acceleration?

[Walesa] I wanted to bypass the obsolete and obstructive balance of forces in Parliament. I was unsuccessful. Our camp, the Solidarity camp, rightly feared a presidential dictatorship and special powers, despite the fact that I demanded these powers in the interests of democracy. Parliament did not allow me to make the changes I was pushing for. I understand because I would have behaved the same way. However, the other group, the 65 percent, joined the chorus. They used the same slogans—but something else was behind these slogans. They tried to block the initiative and hamper the administration of the country.

[Janyska] Prior to the presidential elections, you sharply criticized Finance Minister L. Balcerowicz. Later on, you kept him in a governmental position. Why?

[Walesa] Leszek Balcerowicz is a great politician, and he had excellent plans. However, he would need another Balcerowicz to work with him. The first Balcerowicz is an excellent businessman—he kept his hands firmly on the coffers, kept the lid on inflation, and was good at dismantling things, which led to the closure of enterprises and to unemployment. He fulfilled his task better than anyone else. However, another Balcerowicz should be able to glue the pieces back together, put the still waters into motion, find a new orientation for industry, and give jobs to the unemployed. Unfortunately, we have found no one like that.

[Janyska] Last time, the Central European summit met in Visegrad. Are you satisfied with what followed?

[Walesa] No, I am not. So far, cooperation has been slow and not too profitable. However, the question is whether closer cooperation would be possible under the current situation. All of us are ecstatic about freedom, and all of us are afraid that some kind of hegemony could be established among us. At the beginning, we did not pay attention to others—we all believed that alone we would be able to proceed faster. It has become apparent that this is not true. Today we know that we must cooperate.

We Both Must Profit from Cooperation

[Janyska] How far have the proposals for economic integration proceeded? Do you believe that Czechoslovakia wants to pursue something like that?

[Walesa] During a certain period, Czechoslovakia had wrong information about us. They saw the line and the shortage of goods in our country. Today, however, Poland is stuffed with goods. We have more goods here than in your country. On the other hand, people in your country have more money.

[Janyska] When you were visiting Prague you had a special meeting with Minister Klaus, who was not one of the supporters of economic cooperation with Poland. Has there been a rapprochement in your attitudes?

[Walesa] Klaus was not against cooperation. It was only that he saw the possibilities of this cooperation differently. He believed cooperation was difficult—he saw too many differences. He, rather, relied on the West—and so did we, by the way. Today there is a different situation. We realize that both sides can profit from cooperation.

We will become attractive to each other, if we make a profit together, and not otherwise. We cannot demand a free market from the European Community and fail to establish this market between us. If we want to enter Europe faster, let us unite, and Europe will open to us sooner.

[Janyska] What is your opinion about association with the European Community? First, everything seemed to go smoothly, and then there was the disapproval about the meat quotas—and we started to sound the alarm....

[Walesa] Our countries have done little in this matter. We must clearly say that Europe does not want to accept one percent of our goods and then forces their 10 percent on us. We agree with them, and they reject even our one percent. We must not be afraid to say that to accept us is more in their interests than in ours. They have flooded us with their cars, goods, and all sorts of rubbish. We did not. We do not want them to give us gifts; we only want them to open their markets as we did.

UN Units to Yugoslavia

[Janyska] In your opinion, is there any possibility of solving the situation in Yugoslavia today?

[Walesa] Each nation, each social or family group, has the right to their own spirit, to be different, in one Europe, of course. Yugoslavia cannot want to live in one Europe and, at the same time, have disputes in its own family. How to manage that freedom is given to the nations and, at the same time, to make them live together in Europe is another matter. Conflicts must be solved by negotiations, by referenda, and not by tanks.

It is impossible to draw new maps in Europe. If we acceded to various annexations, separations, etc., then we would have a great problem that would crush us. I was looking at historical maps in Prague: In one century, Bohemia was powerful and Poland was nonexistent, or only infinitesimal. In another period, there was a great Poland and the Czech state was nonexistent. A large number of state configurations could be drawn up in our part of the world. But times have changed. Borders must be open—let the people go wherever they like; let them work where they want. But they must not burn and destroy everything behind them. Then no one would have anything, neither they nor Europe.

Large conflicts may arise on our continent, and we have no means of fast intervention that would prevent skirmishes. In Yugoslavia, it all started quite inconspicuously. First, the republics were fighting with sticks between themselves, then with canes, then someone threw a stone and the other replied with an axe, then someone fired a gun, and the tanks came later on. There is always an innocent beginning. If there had been a fast and decisive reaction, the conflict could not have spread. The best thing would be to go to Yugoslavia today, disarm everyone, and tell them to stop and deal on the international level.

It is not convenient to use one's own forces in Europe to solve conflicts. There are a lot of historically-based ill feelings in Europe. Something like that should be tackled by non-European forces under the auspices of the United Nations. European forces could help in America or Africa. However, there is nothing like that available to us.

[Janyska] Is there a danger that the Yugoslav conflict will spread to Hungary?

[Walesa] Yes, there is. We cannot watch this with indifference. We should discuss in Krakow what the three of us are able to do in this matter. So far, people have been running from Yugoslavia into Hungary with slings and stones. Later on, they will come with machine guns and tanks. The other side will attack them. This is why I suggested that our countries immediately declare that no one with weapons may enter Hungary, lest the other side shoot at them. Hungary will accept refugees but only unarmed ones.

[Janyska] Not so long ago, you criticized the West because its attitude toward Yugoslavia was too passive.

[Walesa] The West is stable and strong; it does not feel threatened, and it does not want to pay a high price. The West does not want to see what is happening in Yugoslavia.

The Slovaks Will Secede Only To Join In Again

[Janyska] What do you think about the Slovak's sovereignty aspirations?

[Walesa] Czechs and Slovaks cannot live in one Europe and, at the same time, fail to come to an agreement between themselves. Many wrongs have been committed, but are we supposed to perpetuate them? We must find a solution. There has been much dishonesty between Czechs and Slovaks, the same as between Czechs and Poles and between other nations.

If someone wants independence, why not? But he cannot bar me from using his roads and air space for transit or to shoot down satellites. If the Slovaks secede, then they will only do so to join in again later. It is impossible to go against the flow. We can resist it, and if we do, it advances more slowly and at a greater cost. We could also do what they are doing in Yugoslavia—destroying each other's most precious monuments—and then tear out our hair in despair. But those who survive will have to build everything again.

We are at the intersection of two roads—an old one, full of wrongs and unsettled accounts, and a new one, that says: Open the door, friend, let us come to an agreement, let us find a solution. If the Czechs and the Slovaks cannot do that, let them ask someone to do it for them—the United Nations, for example. Let the United Nations do the calculations: Here you were given too little, here you were ripped off, and here you were wronged.

The important thing is not to guard oneself against the past but against the future. People in Bohemia and Slovakia are seeking safeguards against a repetition of the past. But the past will not repeat itself. Only new difficulties can appear, and it is against them that one must seek safeguards.

We should take a lesson from the past, instead of turning it into a program. What is happening today, however, is the turning of the past into a program. That is preposterous.

The Czechs and Slovaks want to be admitted to Western Europe and cannot come to an agreement between themselves. They do not want to form one entity but want to live in a single Europe. It is absurd.

Practical Man

[Janyska] What will the talks in Krakow be about, above all?

[Walesa] We are now facing a threefold threat—a military threat, an economic threat, and the threat of crime. All three of us [Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia] must act together in all these areas. We, politicians, speak beautifully; we move in lofty heights. But so as not to fall from those heights very quickly, we must present specific results to the people.

[Janyska] You occupy seventh or eighth place in public opinion polls; you have the support of barely 30 percent of the population. How do you explain that?

[Walesa] I consider those results outstanding. After the difficult period when I split with Solidarity, broke up with my friends, and could not work with Parliament because I had to operate a bit from behind the scenes, I still have not dropped below tenth place. And, mind you, I am not participating in the election campaign. If I did, my popularity would go up. If I said clearly what I was unable to do and why, who prevented me from doing it, I would surely win 90 percent of the people to my side. I am not fighting for that today. I work hard. Popularity, prizes, and glory are important in political struggle. But in everyday work, all these things only stand in the way. After all, I cannot even go out to shop.

[Janyska] There are all kinds of conjectures in Czechoslovakia about why you and Vaclav Havel had not met for such a long time, why you did not see one another during his visit to Warsaw [during Havel's first visit to Poland as president in January 1990].

[Walesa] My enemies blew the issue out of all proportion at that time, alleging that I did not meet him because he was president and I was not, because he is an intellectual and I am a worker. That was not the issue. I am a practical man. To go from Gdansk to Warsaw only to shake hands, when you have no problem to resolve, is too minor. Had it been earlier [while we were dissidents], I would have gone, even if I had to ride a bicycle. I would have gone for political reasons, for the world to learn that we met, secretly, and that we escaped police surveillance to do that, because that was necessary in those days. But at a time when I was a trade unionist and he a president, neither of us needed that. Quite the contrary, it would have only caused complications. I am a practical thinker, but politicians draw political conclusions from that. And they mix up epochs.

Stolojan Introduces New Government to Iliescu

AU1710215791 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1955 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 17/10/1991—Thursday [17 October] Romania's President Ion Iliescu received at Cotroceni Palace the members of the new cabinet upon the initiative of Premier Theodor Stolojan who wanted to introduce them to him.

Addressing the attendance President Ion Iliescu referred to the priorities the new government should take into account, namely the supply of the population in winter, the satisfaction of fuel and energy requirements and the diminution of the imbalance between wages and prices considering more particularly the less favored social categories. Romania's president also stressed that on an internal plane they should be given political and social support so as to ensure a smooth run of governmental affairs and solve the problems confronting the country at present. He also underscored the need for international support that can be given only in an economic and political stability.

In connection with the inter-ethnic conflicts, President Iliescu said it would be well for the new cabinet to work out a white charter on the rights of minorities in Romania compared with those in other countries, including the neighboring ones. He also called on all citizens to let them in no way be drawn into extremist nationalistic activities.

In his turn, Premier Theodor Stolojan expressed his belief that the governmental team would succeed in fulfilling their tasks as they assumed in the programme presented before the Parliament which approved it by a majority of votes.

Stolojan Speech Reported

AU1710220891 Bucharest Radio Romania Network in Romanian 1848 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Speech by Prime Minister Theodor Stolojan on introducing the members of his cabinet to President Ion Iliescu at Cotroceni Palace in Bucharest on 17 October—recorded]

[Text] Mr. President, esteemed colleagues, there is no doubt that today I can be pleased indeed, because the whole team—and I want to stress that it is a governmental team that was proposed to the Parliament— was endorsed by the Parliament. As you know, this morning the Senate endorsed the two ministers: the minister of interior and the minister of culture. This is a very good thing for us at the beginning of the road.

This negotiation, the work that has been carried out for almost 13 days to form the government, and the discussions with political parties, showed again that when there is understanding and renunciation—because it is impossible to manage only with positions that are on two different sides of the table without any desire to reach a final result—that is, when there is this attitude to seek solutions, those solutions can finally be found.

I can say that this government could have been a government of greater openness if certain political parties, with a considerable representation in the Parliament, would have showed, so to say, more solicitousness during this moment in the life of our country. I believe that there was a basis for other parties with representation in the Parliament to participate in the government. I personally feel sorry that I did not succeed in finding this solution, to find a way out, but certainly these things belong to the past. However, they could be a lesson for the future, and everybody must draw their conclusions from this beginning now. Romanian governments will be coalition governments, that is, governments in which each must know when he has to give in and when he has to stay firmly on certain viewpoints and, finally, a result must be reached.

Certainly, we introduced in the program presented to the Parliament the goals of this government, and the president also added some goals during his speech. This overwhelming majority in Parliament that agreed with the goals presented by the government is important. This represents important support for us. It is very important for us to know that what we intend to do enjoys the approval of virtually the entire Parliament. As you know, there were only two votes against it and a few abstentions.

The tasks are not easy, as I very clearly showed in the program, but problems should be approached one by one, some of them even together, should be examined and evaluated, and solutions must be found for each problem.

I personally wish that even today and tomorrow we should conclude this ceremony of installing ministers, an act that we have started today with one or two cases between intermissions—so to say—because in practical terms we must begin our job. There is no time at all. Each lost day for me is a day I see lost. [sentence as heard]

As I told you, Mr. President, we will concentrate the activity of government on priorities, because we do not have any other solution. Otherwise, life will not show us mercy.... It is not possible to remain indifferent to these priorities, and we have to deal with them in a way in which we can prove that we feel responsible for the destiny of this country.

As far as problems are concerned, there are many of them. I have received many notifications, and there are very many of them that maybe should have been mentioned. We will not be able to approach all issues. However, as you also mentioned here, we will have to concentrate on priorities, and there are things toward which we cannot be indifferent, such as the unexpected tension that appeared at this moment, this issue about autonomy. This is a problem that has to be followed with greatest attention, and actions must be taken on the basis

of very clear thinking, because we should not let things accentuate and develop to an extent when it is not controllable any longer.

I reiterate my belief that this governmental team will succeed in fulfilling the task that it assumed in the presented program. Thank you.

Holds News Conference

AU1710215991 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 2032 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 17/10/1991—I am satisfied that the governmental team I represent succeeded in getting the Parliament's approval, stated Thursday [917 October] evening at a news conference the new prime minister of Romania, Mr. Theodor Stolojan. Knowing the difficulties of the Romanian economy, he said, we must start working immediately. After the new ministers are installed, we shall pass on to analyzing all sectors so as to see what we have to do.

The government approved by the Parliament is a government of openness, of half-openness or whatever you like to call it, anyhow it is a step forward from what it was since the political parties are represented here as resulted from the consultations with them, wherefrom lessons should be drawn when forming the future governments. In the context the premier showed that the political parties in Romania should find out in time their allies and have lists with people apt to hold a portfolio in the government.

Answering a question related to the reform Mr. Stolojan pointed out: The reform's rate complies with what has been done so far. The problem is not to speed it up but to bring the reform to the end.

Asked to specify his opinion on the succession of elections in Romania—general and local or vice-versa—Mr. Stolojan said they were delicate but necessary and should be held as soon as possible. There were different points of view on their succession and he stated a consensus should be reached on that matter.

In connection with the Republic of Moldova the premier said he considered it should consolidate its independence and it was only Moldova that could decide on what it has to do. Being a Romanian, I know those who live in Moldova are Romanians, the premier added.

Economic recovery cannot start in Romania till the market economy mechanisms are not settled. He said he did not feel as being a crown prince of the reform but it existed and it should be implemented.

If the National Salvation Front had not proved understanding and had not given up the advantages it got from the May 20, 1990 elections when it obtained absolute majority, the current government could not have been formed. Mr. Petre Roman played a major role in his capacity as FSN national leader.

Romania's sovereignty and territorial integrity are things one cannot joke about in Romania, specified the premier answering a question regarding the Harghita-Covasna report tabled at the Parliament.

Campeanu Defends PNL Decision To Join Cabinet

AU1610211691 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 2015 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 16/10/1991—In a statement he made exclusively to the national news agency "ROMPRES," the president of the National Liberal Party [PNL], Vice-President of Romania's Senate Radu Campeanu showed his bewilderment at the differing returns of the Senate's vote for Stolojan's cabinet. I cannot understand why they voted against Mr. Babiuc and not against another minister of Roman's cabinet, and as regards the con for Mr. Spiess I think it was so because he was not previously presented to the FSN. [National Salvation Front]

Referring to the opinions set forth by some who would have liked a government made up of neutral technocrats, Mr. Campeanu specified that such a government was for the time being quite fanciful and unrealistic because such neutral experts could be found nowhere. If such technocrats had been accepted, approved and guaranteed by political parties, it would have meant in fact a commitment of the political groupings without having decision-making power. On the other hand, such a government of neutral technocrats would have certainly been dominated by the country's president or the former leadership, Senator Radu Campeanu underlined in conclusion.

Press Comments on Stolojan's New Cabinet

AU1710112491 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0938 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 17/10/1991—"A sacrificial cabinet" is how daily "CURIERUL NATIONAL" terms the new, Stolojan cabinet. "We do not doubt the new prime minister is well aware of it. We have reasons enough to believe that big masses of our fellow nationals, from the most varied social strata, reacted in various ways to the appeal made before the chambers and the country by the new prime minister who asked for confidence and support." "The sore point remains the reform, which will be the big test to be passed (...) The government will have to manage not only economic and financial disbalances, but also popular discontent, and that will be the second big test."

"We do not want to doubt Mr. Stolojan's rectitude and honesty," the independent daily "ROMANIA LIBERA" reads, "but we find it difficult to accept the idea of his independence from the two poles of the power (...) Mr. Stolojan agrees to be a sacrificial pawn, but what is the cost? It seems absurd to speak of a government of wide national opening or a government of "national unity" as

long as it is made with the participation of only four parties, two parties (Democratic Agrarian and Ecological Movement) being more or less shades of the tutellaging FSN [National Salvation Front], while the PNL [National Liberal Party] putting forth an at least strange outlook, accepted to enlarge the Front's base of popularity, considerably shaking the unity of action of the parties of the Convention for the Establishment of Democracy, hence of that united and strong opposition on which we should rely in the confrontation with the intact structures of communism (...) The democratization of our political and social life is a goal beyond the reach of the little entente or, to put it in other words, of the Stolojan coalition. Its accomplishment decisively depends upon the future election returns," ROMANIA LIBERA concludes.

TINERETUL LIBER considers in its editorial that "the ruling party of the premier-resigned imposed its standpoint, not allowing that it be swept aside and that its election performance of May 20 be questioned, in spite of the serious loss of political capital that culminated with last month's "Mineriad" (...) The somehow natural unflinching stand of the Front, the fact that it did not concede for a moment to yield the essential levers of the executive power annihilated any chance for the formation of the cabinet of national unity that is maybe more necessary now than ever. Consequently, not only has the formula of national unity failed to be achieved, but the new government cannot be credited with at least a "national opening." We would rather say we have a government of national "half-opening," a rather narrow coalition of parties, a motley of experts, independents and politicians—quite spectacular and rather surprising being the recent step of the PNL, which some will praise for its almost suicidal courage to assume responsibilities in an extremely difficult period and others will vehemently criticize for this "deal with the devil" and for its capitulation when tempted to taste the honey of power." [no end quote mark as received]

According to daily "DIMINEATA," what is essential for the government coalition "is that other parties as well—especially the PNL—got what they asked for: decision-making functions (...) The government targets—a free market economy, social security according to possibilities, economic and currency stability—are natural, realistic, clear. The prime minister asked for the support of all political forces, trade unions and citizens for overcoming the difficulties, without giving pink pictures of reality (...) But the courage to spell out things entails more credibility than populism and demagogy."

Poll Indicates Majority Favors Faster Reform

AU1210162891 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0858 GMT 12 Oct 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 12/10/1991—Almost half of the electorate (46 per cent) wishes the reform went on at a faster pace, 16 per cent at the present rate, 19 percent want it slower, 6 per cent want it stopped and 13 per cent have no opinion.

Political options go to the National Salvation Front (FSN)—34 per cent; the National Liberal Party (PNL)—10 per cent; the Christian Democratic National Peasant Party (PNT-CD)—8 per cent; the Romanian National Unity Party (PUNR)—7 per cent; the Hungarian Democratic Union of Romania (UDMR)—5 per cent; to other parties between 4 and 1 per cent.

About 77 per cent of the subjects disapprove of the miners' actions in September 1991, 15 per cent approve of them and 8 per cent have no opinion.

37 per cent of the citizens polled are for a multi-party government, 34 per cent for a government of politically non-committed specialists, 13 per cent for a FSN cabinet, 5 per cent pronounce for a military leadership, while 11 per cent have no idea.

The poll was conducted by IRSOP, the Romanian Polling Institute, on a batch of 2,209 persons aged above 17, of comprehensive national and professional representation.

UDMR Council 'Renounces' Planned Rally

AU1710100391 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0736 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 17/10/1991—As regards the commemorative rally in Lutita, Harghita County, announced for October 19, 1991 the UDMR [Democratic Union of Magyars in Romania] Territorial Council unanimously decided: "In consideration of the spirits stirred as concerns the topicality and opportuneness of the Szekler territorial autonomy, we renounce the organization of the festive commemorative rally."

The rally was to commemorate an event occurred in Lutita on October 15, 1848, namely a rally of the Szeklers during which leaders of the revolution tried to find a way of understanding launching a call to all nationalities.

At the beginning of this month, in connection with the anniversary of the event the Tirgu Mures UDMR branch announced it intended to call a referendum on the autonomy of the Szekler land.

This intention generated a wave of protests from the political parties and public opinion. Ultimately it was also disavowed by the Hungarian Democratic Union of Romania.

Romania's Parliament adopted a statement whereby it condemns the separatist action planned by some representatives of the Szecklers.

Social Democratic Leader on Party Goals

AU1110184591 Bucharest LIBERTATEA in Romanian 8-9 Oct 91 p 3

[Interview with Social Democratic Party Chairman Velicu Radina by Gheorghe Niculita; place and date not given: "Those in Power Attempt a Dispute With the Leftist Forces"]

[Text] [Niculita] Do you have anything new to tell our readers?

[Radina] I want to inform them that certain essential changes have occurred in our party. First, we have completely broken with the National Salvation Front [FSN]. On the basis of the doctrine we have adopted, the name of our party is simply Social Democratic Party [PSD]. We have assigned a leadership at the national level, and we have set up an operative steering collective. At the level of the counties, we have 12 active councils and 10 initiative committees. In numerous counties, we have town and municipal committees, while in others, we have initiative cells. I want to make it clear that we do not want to become a mass party, but a flexible and mobile one like the majority of the social democratic parties in Europe. We have become a party that is represented in Parliament by profiting from the fact that some deputies from the FSN-20 May group joined our party.

[Niculita] This means that, given the current circumstances, you will be asked to help solve the government crisis.

[Radina] This is not quite so, because some power circles are trying to misrepresent this reality. For instance, some presidential counselors "forgot" to invite us to Cotroceni [presidency seat], when the crisis and the political and labor conflict were discussed with the miners and during the talks in connection with the formation of the new government, although maybe we too would have had something to say...

[Niculita] By the way, there were rumors that your group had some connection with the "mineriad"...

[Radina] By no means did we have more connections than the political formations of the Charter for Democracy and Reform. We understood the difficulties faced by the miners and even the correctness of their demands in light of the very difficult economic situation, but we strongly disapprove of the methods used and the acts of violence committed, which were actually nothing but destabilizing and antidemocratic actions.

[Niculita] Did you meet with Miron Cosma during the "mineriad"?

[Radina] Not only did I not meet him, I do not even know him personally. As I emphasized during my denial, there are attempts on the part of the FSN to discredit both me and our party.

[Niculita] Do you believe the scenario described by Gelu Voican-Voiculescu?

[Radina] No. We believe that—aside from justified demands—what is behind the "mineriad" are the clashes of interests between certain foreign financial circles, which would like to get a foothold in the Romanian economy, as well as between certain military circles linked to them. To this I want to add: Considering the serious failure he has experienced, former Prime Minister Petre Roman prepared his resignation so that he would not have to face the situation of assuming responsibility for the chaos into which he has pushed the national economy.... I myself would have liked to call him to account, together with those who encouraged him. Facing a downfall, Roman and even the Front looked for a scapegoat.... Encouraged by the extremist position of certain parties, which want the decapitation at all costs of those who represent an electoral threat, those in power are thus attempting a dispute with the leftist political forces.... I believe that the FSN, and implicitly Mr. Roman, fear that they have lost control over the electorate and that they will also lose control over the prefects' offices and local administration in general....

SRI Director's News Conference 'Unsatisfactory'

AU1110171991 Bucharest TINERETUL LIBER in Romanian 9 Oct 91 p 3

[Gavrila Inoan and Virgil Mihailovici report on news conference held by Romanian Intelligence Service Director Virgil Magureanu in Bucharest on 8 October: "Does it Continue To Be Top Secret?"]

[Text] Journalists showed great interest in the meeting scheduled for yesterday, 8 October, at noon, in the hall of the Interior Ministry's House of Culture, with the director of the Romanian Intelligence Service [SRI], Mr. Virgil Magureanu. On this occasion, clarification of the true mechanisms that were operating in the days of the recent miners' actions and significant details about people and political groups that might have been involved were expected. The fact that the audience seemed to feel that the answers given to the matters discussed were "unsatisfactory" was not exclusively the fault of the host. Unfortunately, many of the questions that were asked by the journalists who were present were not appropriate and did not lead to the expected clarifications. Instead of clarifications, this news conference did nothing but further confuse the picture that we have of the September events. We are referring here to the fact that, once again, the meeting was used in an ineffective way because the SRI representatives avoided quite a few straight answers by saying that the investigation into the events had not been completed. Then why was such a news conference organized?

Referring to the issue of "miners' actions in 1991," Mr. Magureanu said that the assertions that attempts were made to distribute weapons to miners at the time of their

departure from Jiu Valley and upon arrival in Bucharest have not been verified. Nevertheless, at that time, there were contacts and talks between the SRI director and the miners' leader, Miron Cosma. They were unilaterally interrupted by Miron Cosma before the miners' departure for Bucharest. There was no intervention by an antiterrorist brigade during the miners' trip, because no terrorist action was carried out, and intervention would not have reduced or stopped the effects of the miners' actions. Information has been received that says that other people were also "circulating" in miners' uniforms, both at the time of departure from Jiu Valley and in Bucharest. Intervention by the antiterrorist brigade was planned for the liberation of the Deputies' Assembly hall. The arrival should have made out with the aid of helicopters, but the action was canceled because the miners left the hall without incident.

As far as the report presented by Mr. Voican-Voiculescu to the Parliament is concerned: Similar information was also received by the SRI; however, later verification did not confirm its veracity. Investigations will continue in order to clarify things and to avoid incriminating innocent people. We will be informed of the results later.

The tension that made certain parties ask for the resignation of Mr. Magureanu was pointed out by him in the telling expression: "I have not succeeded in making myself likable."

Proof of the SRI's concrete activity in connection with the latest events are the lists with people's names and data, which made the prosecutor general open legal investigations against them. We are talking about both civilians and miners. Colonel Agirbiceanu, commander of the SRI troops in the Jiu Valley, was reproached for not succeeding in supplying his superiors with all the necessary information and, thus, enabling them to have a general picture of the situation in that area. However, we do not believe that this was done on purpose. Although the miners have said that they left for Bucharest without political claims, Mr. Magureanu had warned Mr. Petre Roman as early as Monday, 23 September, of the fact that Miron Cosma "was outraged by the prime minister."

As far as the famous black lists of August—and white lists as well—are concerned, Mr. Magureanu said that they were produced not by people who were organized in groups, but individuals who carry out such activities every time political disturbances occur.

We will return to what has been said on another occasion. However, we will not conclude before we reproduce the assessment in connection with former Securitate or SRI employees. Their activity is known. Some of them are currently working "within information structures that have been established around certain groups in our country." The SRI does not have any information about the involvement of these former employees in the aforementioned events, but it is investigating the matter and all assumptions are being verified.

In one way or another, yesterday's meetings with the SRI director did not bring about the clarifications expected by journalists, although they would have produced a shock. It would have been an historic moment, because the representatives of the press, and through them the public, would have received clear information about the misfortune that we encounter day and night, misfortune for which we continue to pay with our lives, which causes bloodshed, and which creates hatred between the people of the same nation. Like a curse, the veil of silence covers the action or lack of action that our children will read about in their history books, and about which our great grandchildren will probably read with a certain lack of interest, while studying the work of those historians who, in 60 years' time, will be able to read some of the files that are today marked TOP SECRET.

Stanculescu Comments on Serious Energy Situation

AU1510091991 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1930 GMT 14 Oct 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 14/10/1991—In case that the due hard-currency resources cannot be provided for the import of electric power, natural gas, gas oil, and bottled gas, Romania's situation regarding energy supply will be particularly serious this winter, stated at a news conference the minister of industry, Victor Atanasie Stanculescu.

Comparing with the fourth quarter of 1990 we can ensure only the following quantities: 6,600 MW from 8,150 MW, 850 thousand tonnes of black oil from 2,066 thousand tonnes, 650,000 tonnes of gas oil from 820,000 tonnes. The hard-currency effort to meet energy requirements is put at 400 million dollars, Mr. Stanculescu said. Owing to the fact that the previous invoices regarding the electric power imported from Yugoslavia and Germany could not be paid, import decreased to be placed by the end of October at 550 MW (100 MW from Bulgaria, 400 MW from USSR). 200 MW are expected to be imported from Turkey.

Given such a situation, the Ministry of Industry suggested the opening of emergency letters of credit for the import of black oil and crude, the distribution of industrial returns in a differentiated manner: 80 percent for the import of energy resources and raw materials, 10 percent for the state's hard-currency fund, 10 percent to the economic agents for the import of materials to complete spare parts, as well as the settlement of accounts at an average exchange rate of 150 lei to one dollar, the protection of industry and control over the hard-currency flow.

International

Croatia, Serbia Sign Memorandum on Moscow Talks

Croatia 'Satisfied' With Accord

LD1710144391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1358 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Zagreb, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—Member of the Executive Committee of the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) Bozidar Petrac said today that Croatia "can be satisfied with the memorandum signed in Moscow".

We cannot nourish illusions that the ceasefire will be immediately established, but the very fact that the Soviet Union has joined these activities can be a solid basis for a cessation of hostilities, Petrac told a regular press conference in the Croatian capital Zagreb. He noted, however, that "the memorandum has been received with some reserve because Serbia, Montenegro and the Yugoslav Army got around all the agreements signed so far".

Petrac went on to say that by signing the memorandum in Moscow, (Serbia's President Slobodan) Milosevic clearly showed for the first time that the Republic of Serbia "is a party to the conflict", whom the European Community too describes as "aggressor supported by the Yugoslav army".

The fact that both the United States and the Soviet Union have showed goodwill is positive, he added.

Commenting on the ban imposed on political activities in the Croatian army, HDZ representatives said that there had been some party formations, both in the field and within the HDZ, and that this should have been prevented.

Bilateral Talks Agreed Upon

LD1710223691 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2021 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Zagreb, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—Croatian Deputy Premier Zdravko Tomac said today that the full internationalization of the Yugoslav crisis is the result of the talks between the presidents of the Yugoslav Republics of Serbia and Croatia, Slobodan Milosevic and Franjo Tudjman, and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow on Tuesday.

On returning from Moscow, where he accompanied Tudjman, Tomac told the press that all the factors have finally agreed to arbitration by the international community.

According to Tomac, the communique signed in Moscow by Gorbachev, Milosevic and Tudjman says that the problem should be resolved, through bilateral negotiations, by Serbia and Croatia. Milosevic's signature on the document is seen by Tomac as "proof that the Serbian president for the first time formally admits that the Army is not at war with Croatia, but that it is an instrument through which he is waging the war against Croatia."

The communique provides for bilateral Serbian-Croatian negotiations to be organized within a month with the help of the Soviet Union, the United States and the European Community.

Tudjman Briefs Vance on Talks

LD1710193291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1810 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Zagreb, October 17 (TANJUG)—Cyrus Vance, special envoy of the U.N. secretary-general, conferred with president of the Republic of Croatia Franjo Tudjman in the Croatian capital of Zagreb today.

Tudjman informed Vance about "substance and results of yesterday's talks in Moscow, and set out that the Serbian side and the Yugoslav Army were again not respecting the reached agreement," as a statement released by the office of the Croatian president said.

"Cyrus Vance promised immediately to urge respect for those accords," the statement said, and set out that "Cyrus Vance and his aides presented to the Croatian president some interesting ideas, which can be the basis for tomorrow's talks in The Hague."

EC Holds Conference on Yugoslavia in The Hague

Presidency Members to Take Part

LD1710173591 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1610 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Belgrade, October 17 (TANJUG)—The Yugoslav State Presidency today announced it accepted an invitation to take part in the plenary session of the Conference on Yugoslavia in The Hague tomorrow.

The decision was adopted at today's session which was chaired by Presidency Vice-President Branko Kostic, the representative of the Yugoslav Republic of Montenegro in the collective head of state. The session was attended by Presidency members Borisav Jovic, from Serbia, Yugoslav Kostic, from Vojvodina, and Sejdo Bajramovic, from Kosovo and Metohija. It was also attended by Yugoslav parliament President Slobodan Gligorijevic, and the Federal ministers of defence and internal affairs, General of the Army Veljko Kadijevic and Petar Gracanin respectively, as the Presidency information office announced.

The Presidency informed about this decision its members who were absent from today's session—President Stjepan Mesic from Croatia, Vasil Tupurkovski from Macedonia, Bogic Bogicevic from Bosnia- Hercegovina and Janez Drnovsek from Slovenia.

The chairman of the conference on Yugoslavia, Lord Carrington, and the president of the European Community Ministerial Council, Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek, today invited all members of the Yugoslav Presidency to attend tomorrow's plenary session. The Presidency information office said that an invitation in writing had been sent to President Mesic, and a copy of the invitation to Vice-President Kostic.

The information office said that the Yugoslav Presidency did not receive the text of a document for tomorrow's meeting by the end of the session. The Presidency will tonight discuss the document and adopt a stand.

Markovic To Attend

LD1710194991 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1805 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Belgrade, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav Prime Minister Ante Markovic will participate in the second plenary session of the conference on Yugoslavia in The Hague tomorrow as the government information agency announced this evening.

Tudjman To Attend

LD1810101291 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 0930 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] Croatian President Franjo Tudjman will attend the fifth plenary session of The Hague conference on Yugoslavia. Foreign Affairs Minister Zvonimir Separovic and foreign policy adviser Mario Nobilo will also be in the Croatian delegation.

EC Links Recognition, Army Pullout

LD1810123791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1149 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] Vienna, Oct 18 (TANJUG)—The president of the European Community ministerial council, Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek, says that if a political solution to the Yugoslav crisis and if the federal army do not withdraw from Croatia within two months, the European Community will no longer be able to deny the right of independence to the republics which have expressed this right in a democratic manner.

In an interview published by the Vienna daily DIE PRESSE today, van den Broek says that postponing the recognition does not mean denying the right to self-determination. Yugoslavia can no longer exist as a single state, but only as a loose association or alliance of independent republics, he adds.

The rump Yugoslav Presidency is illegitimate and the EC does not recognize it, says van den Broek. The legitimate representative of Yugoslavia is the authentic state presidency, he adds.

Unconditional Cease-Fire Accepted

LD1810131491 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1226 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] The Hague, 18 Oct (TANJUG)—The SFRY Presidency and Croatian President Franjo Tudjman, in the presence of Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic, have agreed with Hans van den Broek, president of the EC Council of Ministers; Lord Carrington, chairman of the conference on Yugoslavia; and Cyrus Vance, special envoy of the UN secretary general, on a new cease-fire agreement.

According to well-informed sources, at a joint session held today within the framework of the conference on Yugoslavia, the Yugoslav participants have agreed at The Hague to order the forces they control to carry out the following:

—an immediate and unconditional cease-fire;

—the immediate lifting of the blockade on all barracks and military facilities in Croatia; and

—the evacuation of the beseiged barracks and facilities from Croatia in the shortest possible period of time, to be established by a tripartite working group in Zagreb.

It has been also learned that a special session of the SFRY Presidency is under way now, at 1300 [1200 GMT]. The session is due to proclaim these instructions as orders.

Serbia Autonomous Region Leaders Hold Hague Talks

LD1710231991 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1847 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] The Hague, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—Coordinator of the conference on Yugoslavia Ambassador Henri Wijnaendts and the heads of the governments of Serbian autonomous region Krajina and Serbian autonomous region Slavonija, Daranje and western Srem, Milan Babic and Goran Hadzic, today agreed in The Hague to continue talks here or in Paris as soon as possible.

This is the only concrete agreement which was reached today in the Wijnaednts, Babic and Hadzic talks.

Ambassador Wijnaednts, after the talks, briefly told journalists that all protagonists of the Yugoslav crisis are not showing readiness for compromise which according to him is an integral part of every agreement.

Babic and Hadzic insisted that the autonomous regions remain within the framework of a new Yugoslav federation while the E.C. is urging a special status for the regions but within Croatia, which Serbs refuse to accept.

Markovic Calls For EC 'Package' Support

LD1810134491 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1243 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] Belgrade, October 18 (TANJUG)—At a luncheon here on Wednesday with the 12 EC countries' ambassadors, Prime Minister Ante Markovic "expressed hope and confidence that the European Community will continue to extend support to Yugoslavia because its disintegration would be highly detrimental to both this country and Europe," the Belgrade daily BORBA writes on Friday.

Markovic emphasized that the "efforts for the restoration of peace in Yugoslavia should under no circumstances be diminished," the paper learns. The federal prime minister was quoted by BORBA as saying that Yugoslav politicians "have abused national feelings to stay in power" and that "there is no difference between Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic, Croatian President Franjo Tudjman and Slovenian President Milan Kucan—the latter is only smarter than the rest."

"In Markovic's view, Yugoslav problems should be dealt with in a package, with the aim of linking the whole of Yugoslavia to the EC," says the paper. Markovic is said to have told the ambassadors that, as part of dealing with the crisis, "the borders and the right of each people to self-determination would have to be guaranteed and full protection of the minorities secured."

"In Markovic's opinion," writes BORBA, "it is essential to lay down the rules for a transition period until new relations are established in Yugoslavia, but the problem here is the refusal of Slovenia and Croatia to accept such solutions." Last June the two northwestern republics unilaterally proclaimed their sovereignty and independence. Markovic believes, the paper says, that the "impending economic and social catastrophe will bring people to their senses and signs of sobering may be noticed in all parts of Yugoslavia. This process will start in Slovenia and it is inevitable."

Markovic considers the Yugoslav Army and the minorities to be the factors "hampering the calming of the situation." He was quoted by BORBA as saying that an economic blockade of Yugoslavia by the EC, "which nobody wants, would be a catastrophe, but could also constitute a shock therapy and lead to sobering."

Assessing the chances of individual republics to survive alone, the prime minister said, according to the paper, that "Slovenia is the most developed among them, but also most dependent on the Yugoslav market," while the "least developed republics of Montenegro, Bosnia-Hercegovina and Macedonia and the autonomous province of Kosovo can continue to vegetate for a time."

The worst situation is in Croatia, although it is not much better in Serbia, said Markovic, noting that "serious confrontations could take place in that republic."

Commenting on Milosevic's and Tudjman's talks with Gorbachev in Moscow, Markovic said that "Moscow is very much concerned" and that it probably understands the Yugoslav crisis best because "they face the same kind of problems." "However," he added, "Gorbachev has lost control over the Soviet economy and therefore cannot do much alone."

Croatia, Slovenia To Attend NATO Assembly

LD1810070291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2253 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Madrid, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—The representatives of two secessionist Yugoslav republics, Croatia and Slovenia, will attend the annual assembly of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) parliamentarians, which opens in Madrid on Friday, as "guests," as announced here today.

Asked by TANJUG's Madrid correspondent why Yugoslavia or anyone else from Yugoslavia had not been invited to the NATO Assembly of parliamentarians, Secretary General of the Standing Committee of the Assembly Peter Corterier of Germany said that the representatives of Croatia and Slovenia were attending the meeting in the capacity as "guest."

According to Corterier, Croatia and Slovenia had themselves asked to come and it was "the right of the president" of the Assembly to establish the list of guests.

The Assembly, which is made up of 200 representatives of the parliaments of the 16 NATO member-countries, will also be attended by the delegations of Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union as associated members, and by the representatives of the Soviet Baltic republics and the Russian Federation as observers.

Kadijevic Letter to UN Envoy on Vukovar Convoy

LD1710230291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1833 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Belgrade, 17 Oct (TANJUG)—Army General Veljko Kadijevic, federal secretary for national defense, sent a letter to Hans van den Broek in The Hague. The text of the letter sent to TANJUG reads:

"Esteemed minister,

In the letter Croatian President Franjo Greguric sent to you on 14 October he cites lies and accuses the Yugoslav People's Army [YPA] of not permitting the humanitarian convoy to enter Vukovar. I wish to inform you of the following:

In the 8 October 1991 memorandum of agreement it was agreed that urgent steps would be taken "to organize the delivery of provisions, food, and medicines to the civilian population in Vukovar and Vinkovci." At the request of, and under the organization of, the observer

mission, an agreement was reached with Croatian representatives on the time, route, and entry of the convoy into Vukovar on 11 October 1991. YPA members met the convoy at the appointed time at the agreed place near Zidine village. During checks in the presence of observer mission representatives a bomb was found in the second convoy vehicle. After it was discovered that the humanitarian convoy was being misused, the observer mission representatives and the Croatian authorities decided to return the convoy to Vinkovci, and that it should again set off for Vukovar the following day.

According to the agreement, YPA representatives waited for the convoy in the village of Marinci on 12 October 1991 at 0830 [0730 GMT] when it was due to appear until 1710 when they were informed that the convoy would not come that day for reasons which were unknown to us. The next day, 13 October, the convoy arrived in Marinci village at 1300 instead of in the morning as announced earlier. The convoy was checked within only one hour but it arrived in Vukovar at 1745 because it had been hindered by members of the local territorial defense. So a representative of the EC observer mission, faced with a number of options, decided that the relief convoy would stay overnight in the Vukovar barracks.

Having been checked, the convoy could have left the barracks on the morning of 14 October via the shortest route (about 700 meters) and entered the part of the town controlled by the Croatian armed formations. The Croatian forces commander however denied the convoy passage. He threatened that "he would shoot at anything, including the convoy, that moved along that route." This is why the representative of the EC observer mission gave up this route and accepted the Croatian commander's demand that the convoy be rerouted to a mined road via Bogdanovci village. After warning about the dangers of moving along that road, the Army representatives escorted the convoy to the farthest point of safety in Marinci village. After another warning that the road had been mined, the observer mission representative decided to turn the convoy back to Vinkovci.

Aware of the Croatian authorities' intention to obstruct this humanitarian action, we informed you about this and other facts regarding the convoy's movement and called on you to invest your influence in order to facilitate the materialization of what we had agreed on. At the same time, head of the international observer mission, Ambassador J. D. van Houten, was also informed in detail about everything regarding the convoy. We have evidence bearing witness to the true state of affairs which shows, in an irrefutable way, that the findings of the crisis headquarters and the Croatian Government conclusions are based on completely untrue and tendentious accounts of the incident.

The accusations that the YPA used the convoy to bring in new forces and combat equipment into Vukovar are totally groundless since YPA units have free access to the Vukovar barracks. On the contrary, the convoy's advance toward Vukovar was exploited as an opportunity to attack YPA units and the villages of Nustar and Marinci where a number of YPA members and civilians died.

This suggests that the Croatian side does not care in the least whether the convoy arrives in Vukovar and brings in supplies and evacuates the wounded and sick. The Croatian intention to obstruct the implementation of the obligations it has assumed under the agreed memorandum of 8 October 1991 by preventing the humanitarian relief convoy from reaching Vukovar and to exploit the whole case for political and propaganda aims is obvious.

Apart from this I want to acquaint you with my belief that the YPA will continue to observe all obligations it has taken on under the agreements reached so far. This is why I propose three possible options of implementing point 5 of the agreed memorandum of 8 October 1991:

1. that the convoy reach Vukovar by the shortest route from the direction of the YPA barracks;

2. that the convoy move via Marinci village while YPA units provide protection up to the remotest point under its control and take no responsibility for the convoy's further movement;

3. that the humanitarian aid be transported and the wounded evacuated by ship via the Danube river.

Yours truly,

Army General Veljko Kadijevic, federal secretary for national defense

Finally, it is stated that the letter was also sent to UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, head of the international observer mission, Ambassador J.D. van Houten, the Committee of CSCE High Officers in Prague, and Croatian President Franjo Greguric.

Federal

Prosecutor To Institute Criminal Secession Charges

LD1710231391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1714 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Belgrade, October 17 (TANJUG)—The office of the Yugoslav federal public prosecutor will institute criminal proceedings against persons in the republics of Slovenia and Croatia responsible for the "attempt at breaking away a part of the territory of Yugoslavia."

The office of the federal public prosecutor today issued a statement, signed by Federal Public Prosecutor Ljubomir Prljeta, which qualified as "one of the gravest crimes under the penal code of Yugoslavia" the attempt made by Slovenia and Croatia to secede "by means of force and other anti-constitutional means."

The statement said that "the necessary information and evidence for instituting criminal proceedings" were being collected.

Slovenia and Croatia adopted decisions on their independence on June 25 this year. The implementation of their decisions was suspended for a three-month period under an agreement reached through the mediation of the European Community. The Slovene and Croatian parliaments reaffirmed their decisions on October 7 and 8, respectively, after the three-month moratorium expired.

The office of the federal public prosecutor learned today that "many acts of violence have been undertaken" in Slovenia and Croatia since late June for the purpose of achieving the [words indistinct].

The office of the federal public prosecutor said that Slovenia's decision of October 7 and Croatia's of October 8 were proof that the two republics were determined "to break away a part of the territory of Yugoslavia by force and unconstitutional means."

Naval District Agrees To Withdrawal From Pula

LD1810053791 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 2130 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] In the course of the next three weeks, the soldiers of the 3d Naval District of Pula will withdraw from Pula and the islands of Cres and Mali Losinj. This was announced tonight at a joint session of all three chambers of the Pula Municipal Assembly by its president, Luciano Delbianco. The decision is the result of the Pula Police Administration Municipal Crisis Headquarters leadersip's efforts during the past three months, as well as of those of the National Guard command and EC negotiators. They were also present at the talks between the commander of the occupying army's Pula Garrison, Battleship Captain Dusan Rakic, and President of the Pula Municipal Assembly Luciano Delbianco.

Air Force 'Forced To Step Up' Attacks 17 Oct

LD1810063391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2341 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Belgrade, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—The Yugoslav Air Force Command this evening said it had today been forced to step up combined action with the land force and the navy on the front in the Republic of Croatia because of constant armed attacks and provocations from the Croatian armed force.

A statement released by the command this evening says that Air Force fighter-bombers made sorties in the ares of the towns of Vinkovci, Osijek, Vukovar, Novska, Gospic, Nova Gradiska, Pakrac and Borovo and the [words indistinct] Dubrovnik.

The planes attacked defined targets, bigger troops of the Croatian Interior Ministry and National Guard Corps and combat vehicles, the statement says.

One aircraft was downed in action at about 11:40 hrs local time (10:40 G.M.T.) over the village of Tenja near Osijek in eastern Slavonia, the statement says. The pilot baled out and has returned to his unit.

The statement goes on to say that Air Force and transport units were today engaged in the transport of the [word indistinct] and of personnel and materiel, as well as in evacuating the families of Army personnel from Zemunik and Pula airports, forced to flee before the terrorism of the Croatian authorities.

The statement accuses Croatia of having used the ceasefire, signed on October [figure indistinct] at the proposal of Croatian President Franjo Tudjman, to regroup its forces and prepare them for fresh attacks on the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA). "In this manner, Croatian authorities have again shown that they have no intention of halting the bloodshed and devastation and starting along the road of peace," says the statement.

Dinar Devaluation Reportedly Planned Soon

AU1710214491 Skopje Radio Macedonia Network in Macedonian 2100 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] A three-day meeting of about 100 Yugoslav bankers and several world experts opened in Ohrid today. Topics of the meeting are current problems in the bank operations, particularly concerning the unified monetary system and the legal chaos in Yugoslavia.

Milovan Milutinovic, secretary general of the Association of Banks of Yugoslavia, announced that a devaluation of dinar will be carried out soon.

Foreign Ministry: All Slovenian Ambassadors Resign

LD1710232391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1844 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Belgrade, October 17 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav Foreign Ministry spokesman Srdjan Kerim today said that all ambassadors of Slovenian origin have resigned from their posts. The Yugoslav republics of Slovenia and Croatia unilaterally declared secession from Yugoslavia on June 27. The decisions on secession were ratified by the Slovenian parliament on October 7 and the Croatian October 8. The Croatian ambassadors are still performing their duties in keeping with "regulations of the Yugoslav Foreign Ministry", with the exception of Ambassador Bozidar Gagro in Paris who expressed loyalty to the Croatian authorites, as Kerim told a news conference.

Asked whether the presence of the Yugoslav Foreign Minister Budimir Loncar at some sessions of the four-member Yugoslav State Presidency meant that he officially represented this ministry Kerim answered affirmatively.

The Yugoslav State Presidency began holding sessions without the representatives of Croatia, Bosnia-Hercegovina, Macedonia and Slovenia on October 3 when it decided to work in "conditions of imminent danger of war".

Sprikovski Named New Defense Under Secretary

LD1810093291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1305 GMT 15 Oct 91

[Text] Belgrade, 15 Oct (TANJUG)—TANJUG has learned that, following successful medical treatment, Colonel General Aleksandar Spirkovski has been appointed to the post of under secretary in the Federal Secretariat for National Defense by decree of the SFRY Presidency. Spirovski was appointed to the post after Admiral Bozidar Grubisic deserted the Yugoslav People's Army and offered his services to the Croatian leadership.

Bosnia-Hercegovina

Izetbegovic Still Hopes for Loose Federation

AU1810103791 Sarajevo Radio Sarajevo Network in Serbo-Croatian 2100 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] In a conversation with foreign journalists, Alija Izetbegovic, president of the Bosnia-Hercegovina Presidency, stated today that the international community is still counting on the survival of at least some kind of loose federation. If this possibility vanishes, Izetbegovic said, the citizens of Bosnia-Hercegovina will be asked to express their views on the future of the republic in a referendum.

Answering the question on whether Bosnia-Hercegovina can remain independent considering the pretensions to its territory, especially in view of the statements by Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic, Izetbegovic said that so far he has not heard President Milosevic directly expressing any territorial pretensions.

Izetbegovic said that [Serbian] regions in Bosnia-Hercegovina are illegal and that the republican assembly had declared them legally null and void. Setting up regions in Bosnia-Hercegovina, he said, is a typical example of one-sided, unilateral acts. According to him, the Serbian Democratic Party is applying two different criteria. The party sharply denounces and rejects the decisions of Slovenia and Croatia as unilateral, and yet at the same time it is trying to impose unilateral solutions in Bosnia-Hercegovina.

Answering the question on whether any thought was given to using force against the regions, if they do not respect the decisions of the official organs of the republic, Izetbegovic said that he does not consider force and that one should use political means. According to him, everything should be resolved within the general solution to the Yugoslav crisis.

Journalists were also interested in whether the Army sought permission from Izetbegovic to withdraw its troops from Croatia to Bosnia-Hercegovina. He said that, according to the existing laws, the Army is not obliged to seek such permission.

Interior Minister on 'Deteriorated' Security

AU1710142791 Sarajevo Radio Sarajevo Network in Serbo-Croatian 2100 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Alija Delimustafic, minister of internal affairs of Bosnia-Hercegovina, sent a letter today to all public security services, stations, and the highest organs of the republic in which he warns of the deterioration in the security situation because of the latest events in the republic. Your immediate task, Delimustafic tells the public security services and stations, with which you should persist is the creation of conditions to responsibly, independently, and professionally carry out all tasks in the powers of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. In this connection, it is essential to eliminate and prevent influences and pressures that are constantly being exerted by various political parties, groups, and individuals on the cadres and services of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

In Delimustafic's assessment, adherence to the demands of current politics at this moment would have unforeseeable consequences for the entire security of the citizens and property of the republic.

Reaction to Bosnian Assembly Sovereignty Decision

Official Confirms Validity

AU1810104791 Sarajevo Radio Sarajevo Network in Serbo-Croatian 2100 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Regarding the statement by Momcilo Krajisnik, president of the Bosnia-Hercegovina Assembly, that the last session of the parliament was illegal, unconstitutional, and unlawful, Avdo Campara, general secretary of the Assembly, today addressed the public saying that the assembly decisions are valid.

The platform of the Bosnia-Hercegovina Presidency and the memorandum [on sovereignty], Campara claims, are legally valid decisions based on the Constitution of Bosnia-Hercegovina, the assembly's rules of procedure, and the freely expressed will of the absolute majority of the deputies in the parliament.

Referring the matter to the Council for National Equality is impossible, Campara says, especially in view of the fact that Amendment 70, Point 10 is not a completed constitutional provision. According to this amendment, the council should work in accordance with the law on the council. Since this law has not been passed, one cannot talk about a complete constitutional provision, and thus the work of the nonexistent council.

Attempt 'To Cheat' Serbs

LD1810111391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1134 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Trebinje, 17 Oct (TANJUG)— Dr. Nikola Koljevic, member of the Bosnia-Hercegovina Presidency, said in Trebinje today that the recent session of the Bosnian Assembly "was the final attempt to cheat the Serbian people."

I think, added Koljevic, it is better to have experienced this now that everything has come out in the open, because the same day we agreed with Mr. Izetbegovic that, if there is no coordination of stands, we will conduct a plebiscite. None of the parties at the moment have a mandate to speak on behalf of the people, because they were elected at the time when the question of secession from Yugoslavia or of remaining in Yugoslavia was not even raised.

Only the Serbian Democratic Party maintained the stand that it would remain in Yugoslavia with the other Serbian people regardless of others, right from the very beginning. We agreed on this and we have been cheated. We could not agree to being cheated, and you are aware of the fact that the assembly's mandate was extended illegitimately, illegally, and unconstitutionally, even once it officially expired, Koljevic said.

Bosnian Serbs Denounce Act

AU1710165291 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 1400 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Interview with Radovan Karadzic, president of the Serbian Democratic Party of Bosnia-Hercegovina, by Srdjan Savic in Belgrade on 17 October—recorded]

[Text] [Savic] Mr. Karadzic, what is the situation in Bosnia-Hercegovina after the parliament's decision proclaiming Bosnia-Hercegovina's sovereignty? I refer particularly to the position of the Serbian people.

[Karadzic] The actual legal position of the Serbian people is unchanged, considering that nothing has been proclaimed, because a group of Muslim and Croat deputies, together with some opposition deputies, held an illegal meeting, a meeting that was both called and chaired by the vice president of the Assembly who does not have the right to do that. These documents could not be voted on, because, according to constitutional procedure, they would have to have been sent to the council for national equality. In brief, all this was illegal and invalid. Therefore, the position of the Serbian people has not changed.

However, something else happened. It has been openly demonstrated what our partners intend to do, what they want. What they want is to separate Bosnia-Hercegovina from Yugoslavia, to form an independent state, or even an independent state in a loose union with other states.

[Savic] Do you think that someone has influenced this decision?

[Karadzic] Not only influenced. The entire Party of Democratic Action and the Croatian Democratic Community did that under the patronage of Mr. Izetbegovic, who did a lot of damage to himself with this, because he lost his credibility in Europe. Europe respects constitutional and parliamentary procedures very much, and will not accept such illegal acts. We think that everything was done because of The Hague and the Friday [18 October], because of the meeting scheduled to take place in The Hague tomorrow, where one expects to hear statements such as: Well, we now have four republics in favor a loose union and two in favor a federation, so let us make these two republics go into a loose union with the rest of the republics. However, this will not happen, because Serbs in Bosnia-Hercegovina should be asked about their own fate.

Muslim-Serb Party Criticizes Move

AU1710181091 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 1400 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Dragan Mihovic report from Herceg Novi]

[Excerpts] The fact that, as a rule, no army member has been killed during a fire exchange, but that there is a series of victims during a cease-fire and a guaranteed truce sufficiently shows how the Croatian side fails to obey even the most elementary rules and how every part of this territory is unsafe. It would need a special talent to explain (?the lies) whose volume becomes clear when one comes to the site.

One more soldier of the Yugoslav People's Army was killed last night. However, despite the indignation of the soldiers, it is peaceful here, and negotiations are continuing. An operational group of the Yugoslav People's Army, a delegation of [word indistinct], and members of the EC mission met today, too. Since the talks are still under way and are held behind closed doors, we still do not know what the conclusions may look like. [passage omitted]

The decision of the Bosnia-Hercegovina Assembly by which this republic proclaimed its sovereignty did not go without a reaction in Herceg Novi. Dr. Iso Kalac, president of the Democratic Muslim-Serbian Party has sent two announcements to the press center. One of them says the following:

The sovereignty of Bosnia-Hercegovina that has been just voted for is absurd and completely senseless. Something similar happened to the Serbian people during the so-called independent state of Croatia. Since one part of Bosnia-Hercegovina belonged to this monstrous formation, does this mean that Alija Izetbegovic and his Party of Democratic Action, with the help of the Croatian Democratic Community, want to bring Bosnia-Hercegovina into a new independent state of Croatia which would be lead by Franjo Tudjman instead of Ante

Pavelic? My Democratic Muslim-Serbian Party, all its members together with me, and its president, will strive for the abolition of this decision. [passage omitted]

Hercegovina Serbs Against Izetbegovic as Hague Envoy

LD1710235791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2028 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Sarajevo, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—The assembly of the so-called Serbian Autonomous Region (SAR) Hercegovina said on Thursday it did not recognize Bosnia-Hercegovina Presidency President Alija Izetbegovic as its representative in international contacts or at the conference in The Hague. SAR Hercegovina was proclaimed by a decision of the region's majority Serbian population. It comprises eight municipalities, with Trebinje as the center.

On September 17, the government of Bosnia-Hercegovina assessed the proclamation of the autonomous region as unconstitutional. SAR Hercegovina today reacted to the proclamation of the Bosnia-Hercegovina Assembly's decision on the republic's sovereignty on October 15, without the presence of the representatives of the Serbian Democratic Party. Izetbegovic was criticized for being the main protagonist of the attempted secession of Bosnia-Hercegovina from Yugoslavia.

The assembly of the SAR Hercegovina said it would chose its own representative to represent the interests of Serbs in the region in The Hague.

Abdulah Konjicija, president of the Chamber of Citizens, one of the three chambers of the Bosnia-Hercegovina assembly, told TANJUG today that, under the republican constitution, the assembly makes decisions "by a majority of votes of the total number of deputies." Konjicija was responding to a statement by Yugoslav parliament legal expert Radovan Sturanovic who said that "the latest decision of the Bosnia-Hercegovina Assembly without the representatives, that is, the consent of the representatives of the Serbian people, do not have constitutional legitimacy and represent gross and unconstitutional majorization against the Serbian people in Bosnia-Hercegovina."

Sandzak Muslims Plan 25-27 Oct Referendum

AU1710135391 Sarajevo Radio Sarajevo Network in Serbo-Croatian 2100 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Speaking on the subject of the referendum for the political autonomy of Sandzak, which is to take place on 25-27 October, Rasim Rajic, Party of Democratic Action secretary general, told news correspondents in Sarajevo today that the Sandzak Muslims have the constitutional right to say what their future status will be.

Commenting on the announcement by Dragutin Zelenovic, president of the Serbian Government, banning the work of the Party of Democratic Action in Serbia, Rajic said that there is no kind of legal possibility to support that, because the Party of Democratic Action is not the referendum organizer. The organizer is the Muslim National Council. He added that the Party of Democratic Action would respect the will of Muslim people, regardless of what it might be.

Croatia

Agreement Reached on Vukovar Convoy's Transit

LD1710134291 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] At the conclusion of another round of negotiations this mornig between Colonel Stamenkovic, representative of the Yyugoslav Army, and representatives of the Croatian authorities in Zagreb's I Hotel, Andrija Hebrang, Republic of Croatia minister of health, spoke to our reporter Tihomir Vinkovic.

[Begin recording] [Vinkovic] Mr. Hebrang, did you achieve anything at the negotiations this morning?

[Hebrang] We succeeded in reaching an agreement on the convoy for Vukovar. We found a solution which suits both sides and the details are being worked out at the moment. I expect that it will take about 30 hours to finalize the agreement and after that the convoy will be able to set off.

[Vinkovic] Will the convoy set off on Saturday?

[Hebrang] We expect the convoy to move on Saturday morning and it will be limited exclusively to evacuating the wounded. [end recording]

Croatian Forces Begin Weapons Surrender in Ilok

LD1710141191 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1307 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Ilok, Yugoslavia, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—The surrender of weapons by the Croatian paramilitary forces in Ilok and the formation of a column of refugees who will leave the town under the protection of the Yugoslav People's Army (YPA) began this morning in Ilok.

In the presence of a peace mission of the European Community (E.C.), another lorry-load of infantry weapons and several machine guns were handed over this morning. The refugee convoy being formed includes mother and children carrying only their most basic necessities. According to the first estimates, the column is expected to number about 4,500 ciitzens of Ilok and neighbouring villages.

Four citizens of Ilok have been killed and as many wounded in the drive to clear the mines laid by the Croatian National Guard around the town. The minefield around Ilok has been laid without plan, and is thus very difficult to clear. The refugee convoy is expected to set out from Ilok at around 1400 local time today (1300 GMT).

Air Defense Downs Four Enemy Planes Over Osijek

LD1710165191 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1600 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Excerpt] Five enemy aircraft will never take off again and [word indistinct] death. The Croatian air defense today downed one helicopter and four military aircraft—two MiG-21s and two MiG-29s. The first aircraft fell near the terrorist stronghold of Stara Tenja, the second one between [place name indistinct] and Bobota, the third near [place name indistinct], while the fourth is damaged and probably ended up the same as the previous three. The helicopter fell in the direction of Baranja. The criminal enemy squadron will long remember this day above Osijek, and if [words indistinct] the Croatian air defense will also remember it. [passage omitted]

Social Liberal Party Rejects Cease-Fire Acceptance

LD1810001391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1530 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Zagreb, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—President of the Croatian Social Liberal Party Drazen Budisa has criticized Croatian President Franjo Tudjman for signing ceasefire documents which contain formulations unacceptable to Croatia. In an interview to the Zagreb weekly DANAS, Budisa said that the formulation from The Hague agreement that "representatives of the Serbian community from Croatia and Eastern Slavonia" would be invited to the next meeting in The Hague, was completely unacceptable to Croatia.

Budisa, a member of the Croatian Govenment, was the student leader during the nationalist movement in Croatia in 1971. Although the movement had been condemned at the time, the present authorities describe it as the "Croatian spring." Budisa said the ceasefire agreements so far "failed to improve the situation on the batttefield where it was unfavourable" for the Croatian forces, but they did stop the Croatian offensive "on fronts where there had been prospects for successful actions."

The consolidation of Croatia's defence is "more important than any acts adopted in offices throughout Europe," as Budisa set out. He criticized Tudjman and the Croatian State Council for taing decisions contradictory to those of the Croatian Government. The least that could be said for them is that they failed to promote democracy in Croatia, Budisa said.

On the co-existence between Croats and Serbs in Croatia, Budisa said that "none of the solutions should be harmful to the interests of the majority people or put in question Croatia's territorial integrity."

Macedonia

Prime Minister Notes Measures To Protect Economy

AU1710211491 Sarajevo Radio Sarajevo Network in Serbo-Croatian 1800 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Branka Nanevska report from Skopje]

[Text] Under the pressure of events on the country's political scene, particularly in the wake of Slovenia's secession and the war in Croatia, Macedonia is forced to defend itself and to protect the interests of its economy and citizens. It is doing so not only through daily, that is, urgent measures, but also by building its own economic and political system. One is working thoroughly and wisely without haste. Available knowledge is being put to use, as is expertise, positive world experience in some spheres, and Yugoslav instruments that have shown vitality in these times of breakup.

This is briefly what Dr. Nikola Kljusev, president of the Republican Government, said at a news conference in Skopje today. He thinks that the measures adopted two days ago with a view to protecting against Slovenia's unilateral decisions in the monetary sphere are only a promising beginning. The halt on all monetary transactions with Slovenia is temporary. Slovenia has reacted and, according to its leadership's desire, a meeting will be held in Skopje next week at which, as Prime Minister Kljusev said, one will talk about everything in detail, including the continuation of Macedonian-Slovene cooperation.

Macedonia will insist for debt clearance to be carried out by the end of the year and on debts being paid to it in German marks and dollars.

Prime Minister Kljusev pointed out that this republic is preparing the introduction of its own currency, but this will not be done that soon, because it is first of all necessary to carry out a revaluation of the common property of Yugoslavia, find a methodology for drafting a final statement of accounts, and carry out a division of everything that has been acquired during the life in the joint state over half a century.

Prime Minister Kljusev also said that statements on damage caused by the war in Croatia are being intensively made in Macedonia. He assessed the consequences caused in agriculture, traffic, and the sphere of investment to be the worst.

Bankers from the entire country are meeting in Ohrid today and discussing protection from Slovenia's monetary diversion. World bankers are also attending this conference organized by the Federal Secretariat for Finance and the National Bank of Yugoslavia. A very high rate of inflation is predicted, and it is advised that citizens' foreign exchange saving accounts should be turned into a public debt of the federation.

While ministers and bankers are conferring, workers in Macedonia are striking.

Montenegro

Assembly Considers Hague Representation, Stance

Bulatovic on EC Document, Sanctions

LD1810064791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2259 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Excerpt] Titograd, Belgrade, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—President of the Yugoslav Republic of Montenegro Momir Bulatovic told the republican parliament tonight that the European Community's (E.C.) document for tomorrow's meeting in The Hague was of the "take it, or leave it" kind. Accepting the document, said he, required the starting of precise actions and procedures and facing their true effects. Rejecting it, he said next, might quite evidently be conducive to an international isolation and sanctions. The Montenegrin parliament would take its stand towards the E.C.-prepared document for The Hague conference tomorrow.

The document, TANJUG's The Hague correspondent learns unofficially, offers outline political and economic solutions within a future Yugoslav association and provides also for Europe's participation as guarantor. In the document, as is learned, the current internal boundaries—unless otherwise agreed by Yugoslav republics—would account for the framework for international recognition of independence. [passage omitted]

Delegation Empowered To Attend

LD1810081191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0110 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] Titograd, 17 Oct (TANJUG)—The Montenegrin Assembly, after discussing The Hague document, concluded an extraordinary session half an hour after midnight. The session empowered a republican delegation to represent this republic at tomorrow's plenary session in The Hague, on the basis of an introductory report presented by President Momir Bulatovic and an ensuing discussion about elements in an agreement on a complete solution to the Yugoslav crisis.

Following several hours of discussion in which 26 deputies took part, most of whom voiced suspicions about the document, Montenegrin President Momir Bulatovic said "we should not talk about the session and the document as if they were demanding capitulation".

This document does not threaten national dignity, Bulatovic said. He concluded that "a difficult diplomatic battle lies ahead. By accepting this paper, Montenegro is becoming a sovereign state". He then noted that this document is allowing the citizens of Montenegro to express their views about issues and problems rised in elements on the agreement on a global solution to the Yugoslav crisis.

Following discussion and a closing speech by Momir Bulatovic, the deputies of the Montenegrin Assembly, without endorsing explicit stands, empowered a Montenegrin delegation to adopt stands at tomorrow's plenary session in The Hague.

EC Document Stance Adopted

AU1810104491 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 0300 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] The Assembly of Montenegro has authorized the republican delegation to support the positions of this republic at the plenary session in The Hague, based on the introductory presentation by the president of the Presidency, Momir Bulatovic, and the delegates' debate on the elements for a global resolution of the Yugoslav crisis.

Most of the 25 delegates who attended a several hours long debate expressed bewilderment in connection with this document, which is to be presented at the conference in The Hague. Following the debate Momir Bulatovic stated that facing this document one should not talk of capitulation. This document does not threaten national dignity, said Bulatovic and added that, by accepting this document, Montenegro nominally becomes a sovereign state.

Serbia

Assembly Discusses Postponing Elections, Kosovo

AU1710135491 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 2100 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Excerpts] The Serbian Assembly decided to urgently discuss the postponement of local elections in Serbia at its session scheduled for tomorrow. This was decided on the basis of numerous requests sent to the assembly and after consultations with deputy clubs. The prevalent view is that the communal elections should be postponed until more favorable conditions have been established. As Assembly President Aleksandar Bakocevic explained, the decision to postpone the elections is based on the fact that the country is in an extraordinary situation, that a certain number of people are in the units of the Yugoslav People's Army, and that they will therefore not be able to vote or take part in the preelection activities. [passage omitted]

After a one and a half hour discussion, the assembly also adopted the law which abolishes the Kosovo Academy of Sciences and Arts. This law was proposed by a group of deputies of the Serbian Renewal Movement. [passage omitted]

Tanks Conduct Maneuvers in Pristina Streets

AU1710143191 Zagreb Radio Croatia in Albanian 2215 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Several dozen Serbian police tanks paraded through the streets of Pristina yesterday evening and conducted maneuvers, distressing the population, especially children. This was a demonstration of force on the part of the police, whose aim was to scare the Albanian population before Albanian students and school children resume classes. This has become normal behavior for the executors of the blind policies of Serbia, and it expresses their hatred for their Albanians. Likewise, many military aircraft flew over Kosovo yesterday, causing noise and distress.

Slovenia

Presidency Agrees To Sign Army Withdrawal Accord

AU1710181491 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 1430 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] We begin our newscast with a report on today's session of the Slovene Presidency. It has been announced at the session that Slovenia will sign an agreement with the Army representatives in Ljubljana tomorrow on the withdrawal of soldiers from our republic. At the session it was assessed that the most important open questions between the two sides have been resolved.

Most attention at the expended session was paid to the continuation of The Hague peace conference. The opinion at the session was that whatever the agreement that will be reached, it cannot diminish already implemented Slovene independence. Sandi Frelih has more details:

[Frelih] The agreement with the government envisages that soldiers with their personal arms will withdraw via Koper harbor. It was concluded that the equipment loaded on train carriages be demined and handed over to the Slovene organs, while the offensive materiel [ofenzivna sredstva] and explosive materiel be stored in three agreed upon places in Slovenia. It was also agreed that the originally anticipated number of transportation vehicles will be reduced from 700 to 250. All arms will remain in Slovenia until the final separating settlement [koncna delitvena bilanca] is drawn up. In the meantime the civilians, paid by the Army, will look after them.

Upon the proposal by Milan Kucan, the Presidency adopted the conclusion that the Army's departure has facilitated resolving some of our problems. The final withdrawal date set by the SFRY Presidency has been effected by the war in Croatia. The Presidency also stressed that once upon a time the Army played a different role in Slovenia—that is to say it defended our borders and Slovene integrity as well—and not only the role it has assumed in the last few years.

At The Hague conference tomorrow they will discuss the proposal of its leader, Lord Carrington, for a political settlement of the Yugoslav crisis. This is actually a document that envisages a sort of free association of the republics, outlines the rights of minorities, joint economic cooperation through a customs union, political and security cooperation, and cooperation on the basis of human rights. This document is, in effect, offering the formation of a sort of confederation.

It is a political document that represents a blow to the conservative forces. For this very reason there is not much hope that both sides, for which it is intended, will support it. The Slovene opening stance at the conference will be, as Kucan said, that the negotiations must not represent a step back in Slovene independence. Therefore, Slovenia is not standing in the way of those who wish to participate in a confederal state. Slovenia is willing to cooperate with those parties that want to, but it might perhaps join the community as an associate member only. Although the problem of refugees from Croatia will be discussed next week, we have learned that there are 25,000 refugees in our republic. The Presidency sent an appeal to The Hague conference, to the Army, and to Serbian President Milosevic, that they will finally facilitate the evacuation of wounded persons and medical help for the Vukovar area.

SFRY National Bank Blockade Threat 'Not That Easy'

AU1710165091 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 1800 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Regarding the National Bank of Yugoslavia [NBY] demands, Dr. Marko Kranjec, special adviser of the Bank of Slovenia, said that the [dinar] cash held in the treasury is not disputable at all and that the rest is subject to negotiations with the NBY. Dr. Kranjec said that three NBY representatives will arrive in Ljubljana tomorrow. Dr. Kranjec said that on the issue of returning the cash, the Bank of Slovenia is willing to work under the supervision of a parity commission and under international supervision. Let us listen to what Dr. Kranjec said about the second threat in an interview with Katarina Fidermuc:

[Begin recording] [Fidermuc] Mr. Kranjec, what is your opinion about the second threat, which could really have grave consequences for Slovenia? I am referring to the announcement by the NBY governor that, to simplify, the NBY will block all foreign currency funds of Slovene companies abroad?

[Kranjec] Well, this is not as simple as the governor understands it. We also informed the central banks of foreign countries about the measures that we have undertaken. Therefore, this is not only a matter of the NBY's notification. Also, it is not that easy to ask for all our funds in the foreign banks to be blocked because a court order is needed for such a blockade. To my knowledge not a single country has issued or will issue the court order on the National Bank of Yugoslavia's request. Such things have to be proved first, and then one has to take corresponding measures. I am personally an optimist in this matter and do not believe that a serious blockade will take place. However, the issue will have to be brought to the negotiating table where we will see how much of the foreign currency funds that Yugoslavia has created jointly—Slovenia probably the largest share among them—will belong to the individual heirs of the former Yugoslavia. [end recording]